Byzantine Macedonia: Identity, Image and History

Byzantina Australiensia

VOLUME 13

The titles published in this series are listed at *brill.com/byza*

Byzantine Macedonia: Identity, Image and History

Papers from the Melbourne Conference, July 1995

Edited by

John Burke
Roger Scott

BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

This paperback was originally published as Volume 13 in the series *Byzantina Australiensia*, Australian Association for Byzantine Studies.

Cover illustration: Fol 98v of Cod. Laur. Plut. IX.28, containing the Christian Topography of Cosmas Indicopleustes, is reproduced on the cover with the kind permission of the Biblioteca Laurenziana, Florence.

Library of Congress Control Number: 2017940743

ISSN 0725-3079
ISBN 978-18-76-50306-2 (paperback, 2017)
ISBN 978-90-04-34473-0 (e-book, 2017)
ISBN 1 876503 06 8 (paperback, 2000)

Εἰ δὲ καὶ περὶ τῶν ἀντιπόδων ἐπεξεργαστικώτερον θελήσειέ τις ζητῆσαι, ῥᾳδίως τοὺς γραώδεις μύθους αὐτῶν ἀνακαλύψει.

Cosmas Indicopleustes, I,20.

∴

Contents

Introduction

These studies represent a selection of papers given at a conference on Byzantine Macedonia which was held at the University of Melbourne 10-17 July 1995 under the auspices of the Australian Institute for Macedonian Studies and with the participation of the Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, the University of Thessaloniki, the University of Melbourne and La Trobe University, Melbourne. A further selection is also being published with the title *Byzantine Macedonia: Art, Architecture, Music and Hagiography.*

The need to divide the papers between the two volumes arose mainly from the number of papers offered for publication and partly from the separate requirements of the two organisations involved in the publication of the conference papers. The Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, which is responsible for this volume, is the academic body concerned with Byzantine Studies in Australia. The Australian Institute for Macedonian Studies, which initiated and was responsible for the conference itself, is concerned with promoting an awareness of Macedonian culture and heritage, and the second volume of papers is being published by the National Centre for Hellenic Studies and Research at La Trobe University. As editors we hope that in dividing the papers between the two volumes we have still managed to provide a thematic link for each volume while meeting as best we can the requirements of the two groups, though some degree of compromise has been necessary. Thus although we would have dearly liked to have included many of the Art and Architecture papers in this *Byzantina Australiensia* volume, it seemed more sensible to place all Art and Architecture papers together in a volume more generally dealing with Macedonian culture along with some papers of more general interest. Similar thematic requirements also explain the selection made in this volume which, as the title indicates, deals with the identity, image and history of Byzantine Macedonia.

The conference was the third international conference on Macedonia organised by the Australian Institute for Macedonian Studies. As with its two earlier conferences on Ancient Macedonia (1988) and Macedonian Hellenism (1991), the conference organisers were able to add to our local strengths by bringing to Australia a distinguished group of scholars from Europe and America with, on this occasion, an appropriately strong representation from Thessaloniki. The Australian Institute for Macedonian Studies aimed at providing not merely an academic forum within the discipline but also at making this discussion accessible to the general community in Melbourne and at reaching the English-speaking audience in Australia rather than only the Hellenic one. So in addition to the more specific papers which were presented in a full programme between 9.00 am and 5.30 pm each day there was a public lecture each evening, generally followed by a dinner hosted by a different Melbourne Greek restaurant each night. To ensure that papers were accessible to the full Melbourne public there was a requirement that all papers be delivered in English, the main language of the community, even though Melbourne

also claims to be the world's third largest Greek-speaking community (after Athens and Thessaloniki). In a few special cases papers were delivered in Greek or French but in these cases it was also determined that the published version be in English. Otherwise the conference might as well have been held in Thessaloniki rather than in the Greek diaspora.

This in turn did lead to some problems for both the contributors and the editors. In the case of perhaps only five of the papers published in the two volumes was English the native language of the speaker. Although this worked perfectly well during the actual presentation of the papers, recasting the papers for publication has been a delicate and time-consuming matter. This only partly explains the horrendous delay in actual publication.

The editors do greatly regret this delay. It has been largely due to local problems. The University of Melbourne decided to end its Modern Greek programme as part of a scheme to rationalise the study of languages at Victorian Universities. It was also intending to curtail its teaching of Latin and Ancient Greek by teaching the languages in alternate years and only to a low level. After this latter move was fortunately defeated, the University then separated Classics from Latin and Greek (if that can be understood) and did not replace several classics lectureships. These moves took their toll on both editors. We would not normally mention such events in an introduction but this has been a period of enormous change in Australian Universities, change which has affected not only the lives of the two editors and the editing of these papers but also the status of the disciplines which underpin Byzantine Studies. We only hope that the publication of these two volumes of papers presented at the University of Melbourne by such a large number of distinguished scholars from across the world will be at least some monument for Classical, Byzantine and Modern Greek scholarship and help in the continuation of these studies at an Australian University.

The other major cause of delay is even more difficult to explain. Through no fault of the editors or the authors, five papers did not reach the editors until almost four years after the conference. The editors had simply assumed that these five authors had not wanted to publish their papers with the conference proceedings. Two of these papers involved not merely editing but translating. The conference organisers agreed to pay for a professional translator but in one case the translation, given to the editors only in May 2000, was quite inadequate. We can only apologise to the contributors for this inordinate delay.

In bibliographical abbreviations, Greek and other languages are transliterated according to the practice of the Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium. In the case of Greek, this follows the guidelines of the US Library of Congress. Passages of Greek in the papers are presented in the diacritic system preferred by the individual authors.

The editors warmly acknowledge the assistance of Annie Carter, Catherine Price and Katherine Rawlinson, who all gave generously of their time in the early stages of editing both volumes. They also gratefully acknowledge the patience and understanding of the contributing scholars, who bear living witness to two Greek

proverbial expressions: κάλλιο αργά παρά ποτέ ('better late than never') and το καλό πράγμα αργεί να γίνει ('good things take time').

John Burke & Roger Scott
University of Melbourne, 2000

Abbreviations

AASS	*Acta Sanctorum* (71 vols., Paris 1863-1940)
AB	*Analecta Bollandiana*
Agath.	Agathias, *Historiarum librum quinque* ed. R. Keydell (Berlin 1967)
Ahrweiler, *Mer*	H. Ahrweiler, *Byzance et la mer: La marine de guerre, la politique et les institutions maritimes de Byzance aux VIIe–XVe siècles* (Paris 1966)
Ahrweiler, *Structures*	H. Ahrweiler, *Études sur les structures administratives et sociales de Byzance* (London 1971)
AIPhO	*Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves*
An.Komn.	*Anna Comnène: Alexiade* ed. B. Leib & P. Gautier (3 vols., Paris 1937-76)
Annales ESC	*Annales: Économies—sociétés—civilisations*
Aphieroma Svoronos	*Aphieroma ston Niko Svorono* ed. V. Kremmydas, Ch. Maltezou & N.M. Panagiotakis (2 vols., Rethymno 1986)
ArchEph	*Archaiologike Ephemeris*
Asdracha, *Rhodopes*	C. Asdracha, *La région des Rhodopes aux XIIIe et XIVe siècles* (Athens 1976)
Attal.	*Michael Attaleiates: Historia* ed. I. Bekker (Bonn 1853)
BalkSt	*Balkan Studies*
BCH	*Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*
Beck, *Kirche*	H.-G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (Munich 1959)
BHR	*Bulgarian Historical Review/Revue bulgare d'Histoire*
BMGS	*Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*
BNJbb	*Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher*
Bryen.	*Nicephori Bryennii Historiarum libri quattuor* ed. P Gautier (Brussels 1975)
BS	*Byzantinoslavica*
BSC Abstracts	*Byzantine Studies Conference: Abstracts of Papers*
Bury, *ERE*	J.B. Bury, *A History of the Eastern Roman Empire: From the Fall of Irene to the Accession of Basil I (A.D. 802-867)* (London 1912)
Byz	*Byzantion*
ByzAus	*Byzantina Australiensia*
ByzF	*Byzantinische Forschungen*
ByzMak	*Byzantine Makedonia 324–1430 m.Ch., Diethnes Symposion (Thessaloniki 29–31 October 1992)* ed. T. Pentzopoulou-Valala (Thessaloniki 1995)
BZ	*Byzantinische Zeitschrift*
Cameron, *Circus Factions*	Alan Cameron, *Circus Factions* (Oxford 1976)
CEB	*Congrès international des Études Byzantines: Actes*
Cedr.	*Georgius Cedrenus* ed. I. Bekker (2 vols., Bonn 1838-9)
Chalk.	*Laonici Chalcocondylae Historiarum demonstrationes* ed. D. Darkó (2 vols., Budapest 1922-27)
Charanis Studies	*Charanis Studies: Essays in Honor of Peter Charanis* ed. A.E. Laiou (New Brunswick, N.J. 1980)

Abbreviations

Chil.	*Actes de Chilandar* I: *Actes grecs* ed. L. Petit [= *VizVrem* 17 (1911) supp. 1, rp. Amsterdam 1968]
Chom	Demetrius Chomatianos, *Ponemata diaphora* ed. Pitra, *Analecta* VI
Chortasm.	*Johannes Chortasmenos (ca. 1370 – ca. 1436/7)* ed. H. Hunger (Vienna 1969)
CIC	*Corpus Iuris Civilis* ed T. Mommsen, P. Krueger et al. (2nd ed., 3 vols., Berlin 1928-29)
Cod.Just.	*Codex Justinianus*, in *CIC* II
Cod.Theod.	*Codex Theodosianus* ed. T. Mommsen & P.M. Meyer (2 vols. in 3 pts., Berlin 1905); Eng. tr. C. Pharr, *The Theodosian Code* (Princeton 1952)
CRAI	*Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres*
De adm. imp.	*Constantine Porphyrogenitus. De administrando imperio* ed. Gy. Moravcsik, tr. R. Jenkins (Washington, DC 1967); vol. II: *Commentary* (London 1962)
De cer.	*De ceremoniis aulae byzantinae* ed. J.J. Reiske (2 vols., Bonn 1829-30)
De them.	Constantine Porphyrogennetos, *De thematibus* ed. A. Pertusi (*ST* 2, Vatican City 1952)
DHGE	*Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques*
DictSpir	*Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*
DMA	*Dictionary of the Middle Ages* (13 vols., New York 1982-89)
Docheiar.	*Actes de Docheiariou* ed. N. Oikonomides (Paris 1984)
Dölger, *Beiträge*	F. Dölger, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der byzantinischen Finanzverwaltung besonders des 10. und 11. Jahrhunderts* (Munich 1927, rp. Hildesheim 1960)
Dölger, *Schatz.*	F. Dölger, *Aus den Schatzkammern des Heiligen Berges* (Munich 1948)
DOP	*Dumbarton Oaks Papers*
EEBS	*Epeteris Hetaireias Byzantinon Spoudon*
EEPASPE	*Epistemonike Epeteris Panteiou Anotates Scholes Politikon Epistemon*
EEThSPTh	*Epistemonike Epeteris Theologikes Scholes Panepistemiou Thessalonikes*
EkAl	*Ekklesiastike Aletheia*
EkklPhar	*Ekklesiastikos Pharos*
EO	*Échos d'Orient*
EpChron	*Epeirotika Chronika*
Esphig.	*Actes d'Esphigménou* ed. J. Lefort (Paris 1973)
Eusebios, *VC*	Eusebios, *Vita Constantini*, in *Eusebius Werke* I.I: *Über das Leben des Kaisers Konstantin*, ed. F. Winkelmann (Berlin 1975)
Eust. Thess., *Capture*	Eustathios of Thessalonike, *La espugnazione di Tessalonica* ed. S. Kyriades (Palermo 1961); Greek text rp. with Eng. tr. by J.R. Melville Jones, *Capture of Thessaloniki* (*ByzAus* 8, Canberra 1988)
Festschrift Stratos	*Byzantion: Aphieroma ston Andrea N. Strato* (2 vols., Athens 1986)

Abbreviations

Gautier, "L'épiscopat"	P. Gautier, "L'épiscopat de Théophylacte Héphaistos, Archevêque de Bulgarie. Notes chronologiques et biographiques" *REB* 21 (1963) 159–78
Genes.	*Iosephi Genesii regum libri quattuor* ed A. Lesmüller-Werner & I. Thum (Berlin-New York 1978)
GRBS	*Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*
Greg.	*Nicephorus Gregoras: Byzantina historia* ed. L. Schopen & I. Bekker (3 vols., Bonn 1829-1855)
Greg., ed. van Dieten	*Nikephoros Gregoras, Romaische Geschichte* ed. J.L. van Dieten (*Bibliothek der Griechischen Literatur* 8, Stuttgart 1979)
GregPal	*Gregorios ho Palamas*
HellCont	*L'Hellénisme contemporain*
Hendy, *Economy*	M.F. Hendy, *Studies in the Byzantine Monetary Economy, c.300–1450* (Cambridge 1985)
Hunger, *Lit.*	H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner* (2 vols., Munich 1978)
IstPreg	*Istoričeski pregled*
Ivir.	*Actes de l'Iviron* ed. J. Lefort, N. Oikonomides, D. Papachryssanthou with H. Métrévéli & V. Kravari (3 vols., Paris 1985)
IzvInstBŭlgIst	*Izvestija na Instituta za Bŭlgarska istorija* (Sofia): after 1951: *Isvestija na Instituta za istorija*
JHS	*Journal of Hellenic Studies*
JJP	*Journal of Juristic Papyrology*
JÖB	*Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* (before 1969: *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen byzantinischen Gesellschaft)*
Jones, *LRE*	A.H.M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire: 284-602* (3 vols., Oxford 1964)
Kadas, "Mes."	S. Kadas, "Mese byzantine periodos: Zographike" *Makedonia: Historia, Archaiologia, Politismos* II (Athens 1993) 77-89
Kameniates	John Kameniates, *De excidio Thessalonicensi* ed. I. Bekker (Bonn 1838)
Kampouri & Papazotos	M. Kampouri-Vamboukou & Th. Papazotos, *He Palaiologeia zographike ste Thessalonike* (Thessaloniki 1985)
Kantak.	*Ioannis Cantacuzeni eximperatoris historiarum libri quattuor* ed. L. Schopen (3 vols., Bonn 1828-32)
Kekaum.	*Strategikon* ed. B. Wassiliewsky & V. Jernstedt (St. Petersberg 1896, rp. Amsterdam 1965)
Kinn.	*Ioannis Cinnami Epitome rerum ab Ioanne et Alexio Comnenis gestarum* ed. A. Meineke (Bonn 1836)
Kourouses, *Gabalas*	S. Kourouses, *Manouel Gabalas eita Matthaios metropolites Ephesou* (Athens 1972)
Koutloum.	*Actes de Kutlumus* ed. P. Lemerle (2nd edn., 2 vols., Paris 1988)
Krumbacher, *GBL*	K. Krumbacher, *Geschichte des byzantinischen Litteratur von Justinian bis zum Ende des Oströmischen Reiches (527-1453)* (2nd ed., Munich 1897); Greek tr. G. Soteriades, *Historia tes Byzantines Logotechnias* (Athens 1900, rp. 1974)
Kydones	*Démétrius Cydonès Correspondance* ed. R-J. Loenertz (2 vols, Vatican City 1956 & 1960)

Laiou, *Peasant Society*	A.E. Laiou-Thomadakis, *Peasant Society in the Late Byzantine Empire* (Princeton 1977)
Lavra	*Actes de Lavra* ed. P. Lemerle, A. Guillou, N. Svoronos & D. Papachryssanthou (4 vols., Paris 1970-82)
LCI	*Lexikon der christlichen Ikonographie* ed. E. Kirschbaum & W. Braunfels (8 vols., Rome-Freiburg-Basel-Vienna 1968-76)
Lemerle, *Agr. Hist.*	P. Lemerle, *The Agrarian History of Byzantium from the Origins to the Twelfth Century* (Galway 1979)
Lemerle, *Miracles*	P. Lemerle, *Les plus anciens recueils des miracles de Saint-Démétrius et la pénétration des Slaves dans les Balkans* (2 vols., Paris 1979-81)
Lemerle, *Philippes*	P. Lemerle, *Philippes et la Macédoine orientale à l'époque chrétienne et byzantine* (Paris 1945)
Leo Diac.	*Leonis Diaconi Galoënsis Historiae* ed. C.B. Hase (Bonn 1828)
Leo Gramm.	Leo Grammaticus, *Chronographia* ed. I. Bekker (Bonn 1842)
LMA	*Lexicon des Mittelalters* (4 vols., Munich 1977-89)
Loenertz, *Calécas*	R.J. Loenertz, *Correspondance de Manuel Calécas* (Vatican City 1950)
LSJ	H.G. Liddell & R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon. New (9th) Edition* by H. Stuart Jones (Oxford 1940)
Macedonia	*Makedonia: 4000 chronia hellenikes historias kai politismou* ed. M.B Sakellariou (Athens 1982), Eng. ed. *Macedonia 4000 years of Greek History and Civilization* (Athens 1983)
Malal.	*Ioannis Malalae Chronographia* ed. L. Dindorf (Bonn 1831); Eng. tr. by E. Jeffreys, M. Jeffreys, R. Scott et al. *The Chronicle of John Malalas. A Translation* (*ByzAus* 4, Melbourne 1986)
Malch.	Malchus Historicus, ed. L. Dindorf in *Historici Graeci Minores* (Leipzig 1870-1)
Mansi	G.D. Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio* (53 vols. in 58 pts., Florence-Venice 1759–98, rp. Paris-Leipzig 1901-27)
MGH *Leges*	Monumenta Germaniae Historica: *Legum* (5 vols., Hannover 1835-89)
Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*	Gy. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*^{3} (2 vols., Berlin 1983)
NE	*Neos Hellenomnemon*
Nicol, *Last Centuries*	D.M. Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium, 1271-1453* (London 1972)
Nik.Chon.	Nicetas Choniates, *Historia* ed. J.L. van Dieten (Berlin-New York 1975)
Nikeph.	*Nicephori archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani Opuscula historica,* ed. C. de Boor (Leipzig 1880)
NotDign	*Notitia dignitatum* ed. O. Seeck (Berlin 1876)
Notitiae CP	*Notitiae episcopatuum Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* ed. J. Darrouzès (Paris 1981)
ODB	*Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*
Oikonomides, *Listes*	N. Oikonomidès, *Les listes de préseance byzantines des IX^e et X^e siècles* (Paris 1972)
OrChrAn	*Orientalia christiana analecta*
Ostrogorsky, *Féodalité*	G. Ostrogorsky, *Pour l'histoire de la féodalité byzantine* (Brussels 1954)

Ostrogorsky, *Steuergemeinde*	G. Ostrogorsky, *Die ländliche Steuergemeinde des byzantinischen Reiches im 10. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart 1927, rp. Amsterdam 1969)
P&P	*Past and Present*
Pachym., ed. Bekker	*Georgii Pachymeris de Michaele et Andronico Palaeologis libri tredecem* ed. I. Bekker (2 vols., Bonn 1835)
PG	*Patrologiae cursus completus, Series graeca* ed. J.-P. Migne (161 vols. in 166 pts., Paris 1857-66)
Philotheos, *Kletor.*	*Kletorologion* of Philotheos, ed. N. Oikonomides in his *Les listes de préseance byzantines des IX^e et X^e siècles* (Paris 1972)
Photios, *Bibl.*	Photios, *Bibliothèque* ed R. Henry (8 vols., Paris 1959-77)
Pitra, *Analecta*	J.B. Pitra, *Analecta Sacra [et Classica] Spicilegio Solesmensi Parata* (7 vols., Paris 1876-82, 1891) rp. Farnsborough 1967
PLP	*Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit* (Vol. 1-, Vienna 1976)
PLRE	*The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* vol. I ed. A.H.M. Jones, J.R. Martindale & J. Morris (Cambridge 1971), vol. II ed. J.R. Martindale (1980)
Prodrome	*Les archives de Saint-Jean-Prodrome sur le mont Ménécée* ed. A. Guillou (Paris 1955)
Prokopios, *Buildings*	*Procopii Caesariensis opera omnia* IV: *De aedificiis* ed. J. Haury & G. Wirth (Leipzig 1963)
Prokopios, *SH*	*Procopii Caesariensis opera omnia* III: *Historia Arcana* ed. J. Haury & G. Wirth (Leipzig 1963)
Prot.	*Actes de Prôtaton* ed. D. Papachryssanthou (Paris 1975)
Psellos, *Chron.*	*Michel Psellos: Chronographie* ed. E. Renauld (2 vols., Paris 1926-28); Eng. tr. E.R.A. Sewter (Harmondsworth 1966)
Quasten, *Patrology*	J. Quasten, *Patrology* (3 vols., Wesminster, MD 1950-60)
RE	*Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*
REB	*Revue des études byzantines*
Reg	F. Dölger & P. Wirth, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches* (Vol. I-, Munich-Berlin 1924)
RH	*Revue historique*
RHR	*Revue de l'histoire des religions*
Rhalles-Potles, *Syntagma*	G.A. Rhalles & M. Potles, *Syntagma ton theion kai hieron kanonon* (6 vols., Athens 1855, rp. 1966)
RSBS	*Rivista di studi bizantini e neoellenici*
Sathas, *MB*	K.N.Sathas, *Mesaionike Bibliotheke* (7 vols., Athens-Venice-Paris 1872-94, rp. Hildesheim 1972)
Skyl.	*Ioannes Scylitzes: Synopsis historiarum* ed. I. Thurn (Berlin-New York 1973)
SkylCont	E.Th. Tsolakes, *He synecheia tes Chronographias tou Ioannou Skylitse* (Thessaloniki 1968)
SlEERev	*The Slavonic and East European Review*
Soulis, *Dušan*	G.C. Soulis, *The Serbs and Byzantium during the Reign of Tsar Stephen Dušan (1331–1355) and his Successors* (Washington, D.C. 1984)
Sozom., *HE*	*Sozomenos, Historia ecclesiastica* ed. J. Bidez & J.C. Hansen (Berlin 1960)

Abbreviations

SpBAN	*Spisanie na Bulgarskata Akademija na Naukite*
SpomSAN	*Spomenik Srpske Akademije Nauke: Otdeljenje društevenih nauka*
ST	*Studi e testi*
StBalc	*Studia balcanica*
Stud.Pal.	C. Wessely, *Studien zur Paläographie und Papyruskunde* (Leipzig 1901-)
StVen	*Studi Venziani*
Svoronos, *Études*	N. Svoronos, *Études sur l'organisation intérieure, la société et l'économie de l'Empire Byzantin* (London 1973)
Tafel-Thomas, *Urkunden*	G.L.F. Tafel & G.M. Thomas, *Urkunden zur älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig* (3 vols., Vienna 1856-57)
Tafrali, *Thessalonique*	O. Tafrali, *Thessalonique au quatorzième siècle* (Paris 1913)
TAPA	*Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*
ThEE	*Threskeutike kai ethike enkyklopaideia*
Theoph.	Theophanes, *Chronographia* ed. C. de Boor (2 vols., Leipzig 1883-85; rp. Hildesheim 1963)
Theoph.Achrid.	*Théophylacte d'Achrida Opera* ed. P. Gautier, I: *Discours, Traités, Poésies* (Thessaloniki 1980), II: *Lettres* (Thessaloniki 1986)
Theoph.Simok.	Theophylaktos Simokattes, *Oikoumenike historia*, ed. C. De Boor, revised P. Wirth (Stuttgart 1972)
TheophCont	*Theophanes Continuatus* ed. I. Bekker (Bonn 1838)
TIB	*Tabula Imperii byzantini* ed. H. Hunger (Vienna 1976-)
TM	*Travaux et mémoires*
Vasiliev, *History*	A.A. Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire* (2nd Eng. ed., Madison, WI 1952)
Vitae Athanasii	*Vitae duae antiquae sancti Athanasii athonitae* ed. J. Noret (*Corpus Christianorum Ser. Graec.* 9, Turnhout 1982)
VizVrem	*Vizantijskij vremennik*
Xénoph.	*Actes de Xénophon* ed. D. Papachryssanthou (*Archives de l'Athos* 15, Paris 1986)
Xérop.	*Actes de Xéropotamou*, ed. J. Bompaire (*Archives de l'Athos* 3, Paris 1964)
Zacos, *Seals*	G. Zacos, *Byzantine Lead Seals* (2 vols. in 6 pts, vol. I co-authored with A. Veglery, vol. II ed. J.W. Nesbitt, Basel-Berne 1972-84)
ZbLikUmet	*Zbornik za likovne umetnosti*
Zogr.	*Actes de Zographou* ed. W. Regel, E. Kurtz & B. Korablev (St. Petersburg 1907)
Zon.	*Ioannes Zonaras: Epitome historiarum* ed. M. Pinder & M. Büttner-Wobst (3 vols., Bonn 1841-97)
ZRVI	*Zbornik radova Vizantološkog Instituta*
ZSavRom	*Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte: Romanistische Abteilung*
ŽMNP	*Žurnal Ministerstva Narodnogo Prosveščenija*

Angeliki E. Laiou

Thessaloniki and Macedonia in the Byzantine period

"Thessaloniki is a great city, the most important of the cities of Macedonia. It is notable for all the things that exalt a city, and ... excels in piety ... It is large and wide, fortified with many walls and barriers, so that its inhabitants are secure. To the south, there is a port ... which gives easy access to the ships that sail into it from all parts of the world ... To the east, the land boasts of large trees, intricate gardens, endless supplies of water ...Vineyards, planted close to each other, crown the villages, and urge the aesthetic eye to rejoice in the abundance of their fruit ... There are two great lakes, ... containing fish both large and small, many in number and varied in kind, which fill the tables of the inhabitants of the surrounding villages as well as of the city ... There was no aspect of the good life that we did not enjoy, from the rich yield of the land and the products of trade. For the land and the sea, which from the beginning were destined to serve us, gave their gifts generously and freely ..."[1]

This is one of many descriptions of Thessaloniki in the Byzantine period, stressing the size and wealth, as well as the piety of the city. It is, indeed, a fact that after the permanent loss, in the seventh century, of the eastern provinces of the Byzantine Empire, with their large cities, such as Alexandria and Antioch, Thessaloniki became and remained the second most important city of the Empire, after the capital, Constantinople. It was certainly, throughout the Byzantine period, the largest city in the Balkans.

The Byzantine period is a formative one for the areas ruled by the Byzantine Empire, as it is for the peoples and states of western Europe. It is, for one thing, the period of Christianisation, with all that this entails in terms of culture and mentalities. It is a period, a very long period, of about a thousand years, in the course of which there was much movement of peoples and considerable demographic upheavals, which set the basis for the demographic composition of the area during the early modern and modern periods. Political institutions — imperial governance, strong local communities — as well as political ideology were developed, which influenced the subsequent history not only of the areas governed by Byzantium but also of important states which were outside its political control or which eventually supplanted it, such as Russia or the Ottoman Empire. Even in economic terms, it can be argued that the developments and structures of the medieval period had a very long life.

In general discussions of the Byzantine Empire, it is usually the role of Constantinople that is stressed, and with some justification. In purely formal terms, it was the shift of the permanent capital of the Roman Empire from Rome to the new city of Constantinople that gave impetus to the process of differentiation of the

1. Kameniates 490, 491, 494, 500.

Byzantine Macedonia. Identity Image and History. Edited by John Burke & Roger Scott (*Byzantina Australiensia* 13, Melbourne 2000).

two parts of the Roman Empire, and to the development of the Eastern Roman Empire into a fundamentally new state and society. As the seat of the Emperors and the capital of the state from 330 to 1453, Constantinople had an obvious importance. It was, ultimately, the centre of the collection of resources, in the form of taxes, and the centre of their redistribution, in the form of salaries to officials and generals, or in the form of public expenditures in palaces, churches, and foundations whose role was, in part, that of mechanisms of propaganda. It was, for long periods of time, the arbiter of taste and a major centre of intellectual life. Its role, therefore, is rightly stressed, even though sometimes it was detrimental to the interests of the provinces.

If Constantinople was the capital of an Empire, Thessaloniki was a city of regional and inter-regional importance. Its role was fundamentally different from that of Constantinople for it functioned less as an imperial centre and more as a focus of economic integration and cultural diffusion. I will argue that it played an integrating role for an area that included both the geographic region of Macedonia and also, at times, a much larger area: Thessaly and areas to the North-West, along the Axios–Morava route, deep into Serbia. It is this integrating role of the city that I should like to discuss.

The first important period for the history of Byzantine Thessaloniki starts in the late sixth century and ends in the early or mid-ninth century. It is a time of internal crisis in the Byzantine Empire and serious external dangers from both the Persians and (after the 630s) the Arabs. In the Balkans there were great Avaro-Slav invasions, which threatened both the countryside and the cities. It was in the late sixth century that the Avars (a nomadic, Central Asian people) and the Slavs (for the most part an agricultural people, who, however, were organised into warlike activities by the Avars) crossed the Danube and launched a series of catastrophic invasions into the Byzantine Empire. Soon they acquired the art of building siege engines, which made it difficult for the cities to resist. In 586 (or 597 according to some scholars), a very large army of Avaro-Slavs appeared at the gates of Thessaloniki. The *Miracles of St. Demetrios*, the major source for the events of these years, claims that the chief of the Avars realised that Thessaloniki was the richest and most populous city, whose capture would be a major loss for the Empire, and so he camped outside it with "an immense army". "And," writes the author, "we heard that, wherever they camped, the streams and the rivers dried out, and the earth became a field of destruction (πεδίον ἀφανισμοῦ)."[1] The pages of the

1. Lemerle, *Miracles* I 134. The text was written in two stages, in 620 and 680. On the subject of the Slavic incursions in the Balkans see, for two opposite views, P. Lemerle, "Invasions et migrations dans les Balkans depuis la fin de l'époque romaine jusqu'au VIIIe siècle" *RH* 211 (1954) 265–308, and J. Karayannopoulos, *Les Slaves en Macédoine; La prétendue interruption des communications entre Constantinople et Thessalonique du 7ème au 9ème siècle* (Athens 1989). On Byzantine Thessaloniki in general see, apart from the older studies of O. Tafrali, *Thessalonique des origines au XIVe siècle* (Paris 1919) and *Thessalonique au XIVe siècle* (Paris 1913), and the more recent studies by R. Browning, "Byzantine Thessaloniki: A Unique City?" *Dialogos: Hellenic Studies Review* 2 (1995) 91–104; H. Hunger, *"Laudes Thessalonicenses"* (Thessaloniki 1992) 101–113; A. Laiou,

Miracles give a vivid and powerful description of the siege: "The [enemy] surrounded the city from all sides, like a deadly crown ... Instead of earth, grass or trees, one saw the heads of the enemy."[1] The city was attacked with siege engines as well. There was no help at all from Constantinople or from anywhere else, and the inhabitants were in danger not only from the attack but also from famine. Eventually, the siege was lifted, perhaps because the siege engines were not yet operating properly; of course, our source attributes the salvation of the city to the miracles of St. Demetrios, its patron saint. On the seventh night of the siege, we are told, a large army was seen to issue forth from all the gates of the city, bringing panic to the besiegers. It was led by a red-haired man, dressed in white and riding a white horse.

This first siege of Thessaloniki was closely followed by others, in 604, 615 and 618. These were all very dangerous. In 615, the city was invested by land and sea by Slavs from the vicinity and from Thessaly. The inhabitants were, once again, on their own. They improvised their defences, and were also helped by a strong wind, which the source attributes to the intervention of St. Demetrios, and which destroyed the Slavic boats. In 618, a large Avaro-Slav army besieged the city by land, but not by sea; with the sea free, provisioning was asuured. New techniques, acquired by experience, undoubtedly helped the defence of the city: for example, at the first siege, the Avars and Slavs had covered their siege engines with sheepskins, so that the inhabitants would not burn them; by 618, the inhabitants had built machines that lifted off the sheepskins. After thirty three days, a very long time indeed, there was some sort of treaty, and the siege once again was lifted.[2] This was the last serious threat to Thessaloniki for some centuries. Nevertheless, it took a long time for the presence of Constantinople to make itself truly felt again in Thessaloniki. A major step in the re-establishment of Constantinopolitan authority was the expedition of the Emperor Justinian II "against Sclavinia and Bulgaria" in 688–9[3] which brought him to Thessaloniki. His entry into the city is celebrated in a fresco in the church of St. Demetrios.

Effectively cut off from the capital, for a while at least, Thessaloniki rather rapidly seems to have become an integrating mechanism in the economy and the cultural life of both the adjacent region and much vaster areas. The inhabitants had, of course, to be provisioned, and this led to early trade relations with the surrounding population, including the Slavs. Indeed, R.S. Lopez considers Thessaloniki, along with places like Venice, as an example of cities virtually on the periphery of the effective authority of Constantinople which managed not only to survive but also to develop trade on a regional basis, perhaps more than had been

---

"Η Θεσσαλονίκη, η ενδοχώρα της και ο οικονομικός της χώρος στην εποχή των Παλαιολόγων" *ByzMak* 183–94.

1. Lemerle, *Miracles* I 136, 148.
2. For the siege of 604 see Lemerle, *Miracles* I 12; for 615, *Miracles* II 1; and for 618, *Miracles* II 2.
3. Theoph. 364.

the case before.[1] These would be, in his view, cities which, in the darkest and most dangerous years of the Byzantine Empire, acquired the groups of small-scale traders and seafarers that kept communications open and kept the economy of exchange going. The environs of the city produced salt, a very important commodity in the Middle Ages, and undoubtedly an object of trade here too; interestingly, in 688 Justinian II granted the revenues of a salt-pan to the church of St. Demetrios in order to thank the saint for his help in the wars against the Slavs, or perhaps in order to prove his own authority, which must have seemed somewhat illusory.[2] In 676–7 the citizens of Thessaloniki, besieged by groups of Slavs, nevertheless sought to buy grain from other Slavs living to the south of the city in the vicinity of Thebes and Demetrias.[3]

At the same time, Thessaloniki became a central place from which cultural influences emanated and cultural integration took place. The same collection of miracles gives us another story, very often told, but worth repeating. It is the story of a Slavic chief named Perboundos, and it shows us the early stages of this process. Perboundos himself lived in Thessaloniki, a point to be retained, although his tribe, the Rynchinoi, inhabited an area outside the city. In 667 the prefect of Thessaloniki denounced him to the Emperor as contemplating rebellion and sent him to Constantinople under guard. This, however, was not a popular course of action. Not only the Slavic settlers but also the inhabitants of Thessaloniki protested, although in the case of the latter it is hard to tell whether it was for love of Perboundos or for fear of reprisals. In any case, Perboundos managed to escape from his prison and hid in Constantinople for a considerable period of time. It was hard to detect him, we are told, because he dressed like a Greek and spoke Greek so well that it was impossible to distinguish him from a Greek. After a series of misadventures and misunderstandings, in the course of which he did foment a mini-rebellion, he was executed. At this point, the Slavs of Thrace and Macedonia rose up in arms and blockaded Thessaloniki for two years, we are told (676–7). This time, the imperial authorities were able to intervene by sending grain ships and the city was saved once again.[4] The story of Perboundos sends obvious messages. It is, first of all, to be noted that a Slavic chieftain should have lived apart from his people, in the city. Surely, Thessaloniki had attractions which all could see. Secondly, it is equally noteworthy that, two generations after the last great attack on the city, this Slavic chieftain was acculturated to a very significant degree. To speak Greek so well as to pass for a Greek perhaps meant some schooling; we do not know whether he was a Christian or not, but since no mention is made of his paganism, the negative implications of which our source would surely not have failed to notice, it is a plausible hypothesis that he was Christian as well. In this context, it becomes

1. R.S. Lopez, "The Role of Trade in the Economic Readjustment of Byzantium in the Seventh Century" *DOP* 13 (1959) 67–85.
2. *ODB* s.v. 'salt'.
3. Lemerle, *Miracles* I 187, 208–21, cf. II 117–8 and Browning, "Byzantine Thessaloniki" 95.
4. Lemerle, *Miracles* I 220–1; cf. Browning, "Byzantine Thessaloniki" 94–5.

virtually a moot point whether he truly nourished designs against Thessaloniki or the Byzantine state; what remains is the acculturating pull of the city. The story also reminds us that in the late seventh century the central government began to make its presence felt again in this part of the world, and that Thessaloniki was a pivot in the enterprise. I mention again the triumphal entry of Justinian II into the city in 688/9.

From that time on, Thessaloniki remained as the most important city of the European part of the Empire, after Constantinople. It functioned, among other things, as an area of attraction for the population of the Aegean islands, which fled here to escape the Arab raids.[1] Successive claimants to Macedonia tried to capture the city: the Bulgarians under Samuel in the late tenth century and again in 1205 and the Serbs in the middle of the fourteenth century, all unsuccessfully; and finally the Ottomans, who captured it in 1387 and again in 1430, not to mention the dramatic contest between Greeks and Bulgarians for control of the city, i.e. for control of Macedonia, during the first Balkan war. In the medieval period, Thessaloniki, with its strong fortifications and with a strong army and the courage of its population (which is a constant) was able to withstand a number of these attacks. The result was more than the simple fact that the city was not captured. Thessaloniki, like other cities of the Byzantine Empire, only more so, played the role of organising and controlling the countryside. The fact that neither Symeon nor Samuel, czars of the Bulgarians with imperial hopes, nor Stefan Dušan, who also had imperial ambitions, were able to take Thessaloniki had long-term consequences. It meant that their states, which were very large, nevertheless remained ephemeral, without the possibility of becoming firmly established as they would undoubtedly have been had they been able to control Thessaloniki and therefore a large part of its close and remote hinterland.

The vitality of Thessaloniki after the end of the Slavic invasions and its integrating role is evident through another historic event. Around the middle of the ninth century, the Byzantine Empire began a period of expansion which would lead into the great victories of the tenth century. This was on the one hand a territorial expansion, mostly into Asia Minor, and on the other a movement of Christianisation of pagan peoples outside the Empire. In the middle ages, we know, Christianisation was not simply the exchange of many pagan deities for a single Christian one. It also meant the introduction of writing, where there was none, and the formation of a church, whose members, because of their literacy, became part of the ruling class, and promulgated ideas and ideals which were common to all Christians. It meant that the newly Christianised people became a part of a community of nations, which had a shared culture, shared values, similar art and eventually institutions with a certain similarity. It was thus a process not only of

1. Kameniates 504. Cf. the *Vita* of St. Theodora of Thessaloniki in E. Kurtz, *Das Klerikers Gregorios Bericht über Wunderthaten, Leben, Translation der Hl. Theodora von Thessalonich* (St. Petersburg 1902). She fled to Thessaloniki from Aegina sometime in 819–830, as had other members of her family before her.

the dissemination of a religion, but also of the dissemination of cultural and eventually institutional features.

Among the most important peoples which remained pagan in the ninth century were the Slavs and the Bulgarians. The Patriarch Photios, a great figure of letters and the church, opened in Constantinople a Slavonic academy, where the Byzantines learned Slavic languages in order to engage in missionary activities. Together with Photios, two other men played a role of the very greatest significance in this enterprise. They were the two brothers Cyril (Constantine) and Methodios, sons of a Greek Byzantine official from Thessaloniki. They created the Slavic alphabet, and thus influenced for ever after both the language and the literature of the Russians, the south Slavs and the Bulgarians. The Byzantines were well aware, it seems, of the importance of the introduction of writing. In the *Vita* of St. Cyril it is said that the Emperor Michael III, answering the request of the King of the Moravians for missionaries, said "We are sending you this worthy and pious man, the philosopher (Constantine), to whom God revealed the art of writing. Receive this gift, which is more valuable than gold, silver, precious stones and vain wealth." The two apostles to the Slavs are honored to this day by the south Slavic peoples.

The Christianisation of Bulgaria was followed by a period of peace and prosperity for the city of Thessaloniki, which now became a great centre of trade for a region that included Greece proper but also Bulgaria. John Kameniates, who in the early tenth century wrote a text lamenting the capture of the city by the Arabs in 904, made an explicit linkage between the peace with the Bulgarians and the prosperity of Thessaloniki: "Since the time that the baptismal font brought the Scythian nation (the Bulgarians) close to the Christian people ... the attacks against the city ceased, and so did the massacres. The swords were turned into scythes, the spears became ploughshares;[1] there was no war anywhere, peace ruled in the surrounding areas, there was abundance of goods from agriculture and wealth from trade."[2] This speaks to increased security as a factor that allowed agriculture and trade to flourish. At the same time, there are clear indications that Thessaloniki is becoming an inter-regional commercial centre, collecting the merchandise not only of areas from the South and the West, but also from Bulgaria, which until then had been channelled through Constantinople alone. Interestingly enough, our sources say that this shift, which institutionally had to be approved by Constantinople, was made at the instigation of merchants from Greece proper, who wanted to increase their profits.[3] Indications deriving from the seals of commercial officials suggest the importance of Thessaloniki as a commercial center and the importance of Bulgarian trade coming down the Nestos–Strymon Rivers.[4] The new

1. Cf. Is 2.4.
2. Kameniates 499–500, 496.
3. *TheophCont* 357.
4. N. Oikonomidès, "Le kommerkion d'Abydos, Thessalonique et le commerce bulgare au IXe siècle" *Hommes et richesses dans l'empire byzantin* II: *VIIIe–XVe siècle* ed. V. Kravari, J. Lefort & C. Morrisson (Paris 1991) 241–8, esp. 243. See also *De adm. imp.* ch. 42.

customs officials at Thessaloniki had jurisdiction over Thessaly, Cephallonia, the Theme of Thessaloniki, and the West of Greece, which is suggestive of the role of the city as a factor of economic integration of these provinces or, to say it in more modest terms, as the major commercial centre of the southern part of the Balkan peninsula.

This is a new phenomenon, especially the connection with the interior of Bulgaria, which may, I suppose, have begun even before the official actions, perhaps as early as the peace treaty of 815 with the Bulgarians. For a while, Thessaloniki seems to have profited greatly from the opening of the hinterland and its role in trade. Kameniates speaks repeatedly of intense commercial activity by sea and with the interior, of the presence of many merchants, both native and foreign — again, the indication of an inter-regional role. He reports great wealth in gold, silver, precious stones and "silk cloth, which was to them as woollen textiles are to others."[1] Finally, he speaks of the production, in Thessaloniki, of metal and glass objects.

This prosperity was interrupted brusquely in the early tenth century, when Thessaloniki was captured and sacked by Arabs, perhaps attracted by its wealth (904). The wars with Symeon of Bulgaria, which brought the Bulgarians within a few miles of the city walls, also influenced adversely the development of the area. Disrupting communications with the interior of Bulgaria, and generally launching a period of insecurity throughout Macedonia and Thrace, these wars must have had a truly deleterious effect, as did those with Samuel in the late tenth century.

In the early eleventh century things changed again. The wars of Basil II were followed by a period of general peace in the Balkans which lasted, although with important short-term disruptions, until the late twelfth century. It was a period of general prosperity, with increase in population, expansion of cultivation and increase and differentiation of production. Once again we see Thessaloniki as a pole of attraction of men and merchandise from a very wide area. The city had, of course, its immediate agricultural hinterland, which was very productive, and its own craft enterprises: Benjamin of Tudela mentions the manufacturing of silk cloth. But we also have interesting information about the city as a commercial centre. During the feast of St. Demetrios, there took place in Thessaloniki a large inter-regional and international fair. Here we find merchants and merchandise from four regions: Greeks from the South — from Boeotia, presumably mainly Thebes — and the Peloponnese, who brought textiles, by land or by sea, it is not clear. By sea there came also merchants and merchandise (including textiles) from the West — Italy, Spain, Portugal, France, and also from the East, that is, Syria and Egypt. There seems to be no direct line of communication with the Bulgarian hinterland. But the Via Egnatia was open and well-travelled, so that the products of the Black Sea were sent to Constantinople, whence they reached Thessaloniki on horses or mules travelling in caravans.[2] It is worthy of note that the north-western part of the Balkans does not appear in this source, not because the route to Niš and Belgrade was not open but presumably because commercial transactions with the area were

1. Kameniates 500–501, 568–9.
2. Pseudo-Luciano, *Timarione* ed. R. Romano (Naples 1974) 53–5.

unimportant. The fair of St. Demetrios, then, appears as an important occasion for the exchange of textiles and also of sheep, cattle and pigs.

Large international fairs also had financial functions, that is, merchants made loans to finance their transactions.[1] Undoubtedly, too, there must have been banking transactions of another kind, that is money-changing, as there was at the fairs of western Europe. In any case, in the twelfth century we find Thessaloniki functioning as a centre of attraction for the commercial activities of Greece proper, certainly also of the immediate Macedonian hinterland, of the Black Sea by way of Constantinople, and to a certain degree of areas of western Europe, Syria and Egypt. Interestingly, a twelfth-century witness, the archbishop of Athens, Michael Choniates, made a comparison between Thessaloniki and Constantinople which seems to suggest that the only advantage the latter held over the former was the fact of its being the capital of the state; in all other respects, he seems to imply, Thessaloniki was more important.[2] This role was predicated upon internal peace, stability in the Balkans, and relatively open communications by sea. An accumulation of events in the late twelfth and early thirteenth century must have had an adverse effect on the situation: the sack of Thessaloniki by the Normans in 1185, the rebellion of Peter and Asen in Bulgaria, and finally the Fourth Crusade which, among other things, fragmented the political space of the former Byzantine Empire. In the territorial partition which ensued, Thessaloniki was given to Boniface of Montferrat, who seems to have governed fairly and left a fair amount of self-government to the inhabitants. The city then became a bone of contention between the Emperors of Nicaea and the Despots of Epirus, finally being captured by the forces of John III Vatatzes in 1246, as part of the drive that eventually brought the Emperors of Nicaea back to Constantinople.

In the course of the thirteenth century, in part, undoubtedly, because of the conditions of political instability, Thessaloniki seems to have had more of an orientation towards the West, i.e. the Despotate of Epirus, than toward the East, i.e. Constantinople. During the restored Palaiologan Empire this orientation was strengthened, for reasons which were both political and economic. To tell the story briefly, Thessaloniki became, certainly by the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century, the centre of a system that included the south-western Balkans, that is to say, Greece proper, Epirus, Serbia and Dalmatia. While one must keep in mind that the Via Egnatia remained relatively open until the 1340s and that communications with Constantinople were therefore relatively easy, it is also quite clear that we have the development of an important "western" sub-system separate to a large degree from that functioning in Constantinople. In terms of communications, the sum of our information seems to suggest that the road to and from Bulgaria along the Strymon and the Nestos was not important. Similarly, merchandise from Bulgaria did not reach Thessaloniki either directly or indirectly, nor, perhaps, did that of Thrace. On the other hand, there are good communications with the state of Serbia,

---

1. A. Laiou, "Händler und Kaufleute auf dem Jahrmarkt" *Fest und Alltag in Byzanz* ed. G. Prinzing & D. Simon (Munich 1990) 53–70.
2. Hunger, *op. cit.* 101–2.

with a route that went up the Morava River, as well as with Dubrovnik. From Thessaloniki the areas of the Balkan interior imported both textiles from western Europe, brought here by the Venetian merchants, and wheat; indeed, the wheat production of the hinterland of Thessaloniki was sold both to the Balkan interior and to Venice. Therefore, the city became a centre of exchange of the two main staples of medieval trade, textiles and grain.

To some extent, this strong western orientation was the result of the increase in the political and economic power of the Kingdom of Serbia and its subsequent expansion southward into areas of Macedonia, Albania, and eventually Epirus and Greece. This would eventually bring Stefan Dušan to the gates of Thessaloniki. Serbia also was going through an economic expansion, fuelled partly by the opening of silver mines in Novo Brdo and elsewhere. The western orientation was also part of the effective division of the old Byzantine Empire into two trade areas dominated by two Italian powers: Genoa in the Black Sea area and Asia Minor with the adjacent islands, and Venice in Macedonia, Greece, most of the islands of the Aegean, Crete and the Ionian islands. After the 1340s, civil wars and successive invasions of the Serbs and the Turks almost closed off land communications with Constantinople, reinforcing this western orientation. In political terms, the presence of a strong western sub-system and the concomitantly reduced connection with Constantinople is evident in a number of ways. Already in the 1320s the monk Theodoulos published, in Thessaloniki, two political treatises in which he argued powerfully for local governmental independence, complete with the collection of taxes by city authorities and the creation of city armies financed by local resources. In the 1340s, during the second civil war, Thessaloniki defied the power of the aristocracy and the central government of Constantinople when the capital fell into the hands of the powerful aristocrat John Kantakouzenos and retained its de facto independence from 1341 to 1350. In a different configuration, and before his defeat at the hands of Kantakouzenos, his great opponent John Apokaukos had conceived of a scheme, or so we are told, of creating a coastal state consisting of the coasts of Thrace, Macedonia and possibly the western coast of the Black Sea, with Thessaloniki and Constantinople as the two centres; a state which would live basically off trade. Finally, the political aspect of our topic is illustrated by the fact that, in the late Byzantine period, Thessaloniki functioned virtually independently of Constantinople under the rule of imperial princes who had strong connections both with Venice and with the remaining Greek areas, primarily the Morea (Manuel Palaiologos, Andronikos Palaiologos). Independence there was, to be sure, and contacts with Venice as well as with the Morea, but in this period it can no longer be said that Thessaloniki was acting as an integrating factor, since it could not even control its own hinterland and there were no conditions present for much integration.

Earlier, however, there is one other domain in which Thessaloniki played an important role in the western part of the southern Balkans, and that is the intellectual and cultural domain. There is much to be said about Thessaloniki as an intellectual centre, and much that has already been said. My purpose here, however,

is not to give a complete history of the city, but rather to speak of a particular role it played, with different effect at different times of its history. In order to illustrate this in the realm of intellectual activity, the best approach is through the history of art. Here we see, already in the thirteenth century, a great influence of artists and styles which emanate from Thessaloniki into the territories of the Kingdom of Serbia. In 1265, in Sopoćani, a monastic foundation of Stefan Urosh I, we have frescoes of the very first quality in the volume style.[1] In this period, and in the first half of the fourteenth century, we find artists travelling from Thessaloniki to all of Macedonia, Serbia, Greece proper, with particularly high activity in the Kingdom of Serbia which, as I have already indicated, was acquiring both the economic basis for supporting artistic activity and the political sophistication to wish to have Byzantine art and artists. George Kallierges ("the best painter of all Thessaly", as he himself claims), Astrapas and Eutychios work in Thessaloniki, in Ochrid and in various churches in the Kingdom of Serbia. The church of St. Nicholas Orphanos in Thessaloniki is a good example of the elegant classical style of the second decade of the fourteenth century. On Mt. Athos, the frescoes of the Protaton (1300) are ascribed to painters from Thessaloniki. Churches in Veroia, Kastoria, the royal chapel in Studenica, the church of Gračanica, decorated c. 1321, all attest to the excellence of the artists of Thessaloniki.

I have tried to suggest, here, that the city of Thessaloniki played a major role in integrating the economy and culture, and sometimes the political structure of the western, European provinces of Byzantium. Obviously, the specifics of its role and the area over which it exercised its influence changed from time to time. In the late seventh to the ninth century the city functioned as a centre from which radiated forces of acculturation, of which Christianisation was one major aspect. It also seems to have functioned as a centre of commercial exchange, to the rather limited extent that such activities were still possible. Except for the extraordinary breadth of the missionary activities of Cyril and Methodios which, however, were primarily due to Constantinopolitan policy, the area affected would seem to be parts of Macedonia and those areas with which the city could communicate by sea, i.e. Thessaly and the adjacent islands. The period of great prosperity for Thessaloniki falls into two distinct categories: first, the time when its sphere of influence and attraction included not only Macedonia, Thessaly and Greece, but also the Bulgarian hinterland (ninth century, twelfth century), [2] and secondly, the time when

1. For what follows see *Ἱστορία τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ Ἔθνους* IX (Athens 1980) 434ff.
2. It should be noted that these areas of influence go back to an earlier period. The discussion of the dissemination of coinage by Cécile Morrisson shows that in the period 491–642 the bronze coinage of Thessaloniki is more diffused than that of Constantinople in the area that *grosso modo* corresponds to the historic area of Macedonia. In the two Dacias Thessaloniki is represented by a significant proportion of coins, whereas in Moesia Secunda, Thrace, Hemimontus and Rhodope Constantinopolitan coinage is very much in the majority. (i.e. the division is between the dioceses of Thrace and Macedonia). In the same period, a significant proportion ((31%) of coins issued in Thessaloniki circulated in Greece proper. The coin production of Thessaloniki ceased in the seventh-eighth centuries; it re-appeared sporadically in the ninth century (attesting, presumably, to the

there was a relatively well-integrated western system, comprising Serbia and to a large extent excluding Constantinople (from the thirteenth through the first half of the fourteenth century). Interestingly, this second system accords best with the way the Byzantines themselves thought of Thessaloniki. In their minds, it always remained a western city, the capital of the West, the capital of Europe, meaning the European provinces of the Empire. The *Vita* of Hosia Theodora of Thessaloniki proclaimed it the "mother of the West."[1] The texts assembled by H. Hunger speak variously of Thessaloniki as "the reigning city of Macedonia and Thessaly" (Nikephoros Gregoras) and in general terms as the capital or the greatest city of the West.[2] For an important part of its history, Thessaloniki was, indeed, a centre linking, in concentric circles perhaps, activities in Macedonia, in the western provinces generally, and in the areas of the medieval Kingdom of Serbia. Indeed, a glance at the map will show the inevitability of this, for there are two major axes that meet in Thessaloniki: the great East–West axis of the Via Egnatia, linking Epirus/Albania, southern Macedonia, Thrace and Constantinople, and the great traverse North–South route, from Thessaloniki to Belgrade and from there to Central Europe. The extent and direction of the integrating role of the city was, of course, a function of political and economic realities, as it always will be.

---

economic and political resurgence of the city), and again after the eleventh century: C. Morrisson, "La diffusion de la monnaie de Constantinople: routes commerciales ou routes politiques?" *Constantinople and its Hinterland* ed. C. Mango & G. Dagron (Aldershot 1995) 78–9.

1. Kurtz, *Das Klerikers Gregorios Bericht* 11.
2. Hunger, *op.cit.* 101–3, 107–8.

Johannes Koder

Macedonians and Macedonia in Byzantine spatial thinking

... ὥστε ἀπὸ βασιλείας εἰς ἐπαρχίαν τὸ σχῆμα μεταβαλεῖν καὶ νῦν εἰς θέματος τάξιν καὶ στρατηγίδος αὐτὴν καταλῆξαι ('So it changed in status from a kingdom to a province, to reach now, at the end, the category of a military district and territory of a field marshall.') These words about Macedonia are written in the book *On the Byzantine provinces* (Περὶ τῶν θεμάτων),[1] which was compiled in the tenth century by the command of either the emperor Leo the Wise or his son, the emperor Constantine Porphyrogennetos. The statement concerns the consequences for the history of Macedonia of Roman occupation from 168 BC under the leadership of Lucius Aemilius Paullus up to the tenth century. The explanation seems to throw some light at least on one aspect of the ambiguity of the name Macedonia in the Byzantine centuries. The Byzantine emperor speaks about a region which changed its status during the centuries in many and extreme ways from an independent kingdom to one or more administrative units as well as military districts of another, greater empire, a region submitted to frequently changing political, cultural, ethnic and economic influences, and this within changing geographical dimensions. Though it is impossible for the compilers of *De thematibus* to express these manifold developments within a short comment, they yet convey in these few lines a feeling of the glorious past and of the present (tenth century) decline of what Macedonia meant for them.

I am aware of the complexity of the problems related to the geographical term 'Macedonia' and the ethnonym 'Macedonians' in the ninteenth and twentieth centuries and especially in recent decades, and so my task is rather simple: I would like to discuss the development of different aspects of these terms during the Byzantine period, from the fourth century until the early years of the Tourkokratia. Therefore my paper will rely strictly on the written sources of this period. A special emphasis is given to the late Middle Ages, in other words to the reign of the Palaiologan dynasty from the late thirteenth to the mid fifteenth century. This seems justified because the late Byzantine period reveals (at least in predisposition) new and differentiated religious, ideological, cultural and political positions in southeastern Europe, which indicate in advance or anticipate already the developments of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.[2]

---

1. *De them.* 2.2 (Pertusi 88).
2. Short Bibliography: K.I. Amantos, *Μακεδονικά. Συμβολή εις την μεσαιωνικήν ιστορίαν και εθνολογίαν της Μακεδονίας* (Athens 1920); N.P. Andriotis, "History of the Name 'Macedonia'" *BalkSt* 1 (1960) 143–8; S. Antaljak & B. Panov, *Srednovekovna Makedonija* I–III (Skopje 1985); *ByzMak* (Thessaloniki 1995); *Χριστιανική Θεσσαλονίκη, ΚΒ΄ Δημήτρια: Παλαιολόγειος εποχή· ΚΓ΄ Δημήτρια: Από του αποστόλου Παύλου μέχρι και της Κωνσταντινείου*

Byzantine Macedonia. Identity Image and History. Edited by John Burke & Roger Scott (*Byzantina Australiensia* 13, Melbourne 2000).

In our tour d'horizon we shall include not only the terms 'Macedonia' and 'Makedones' but also, in so far as it is necessary, the geopolitically related geographical names of neighbouring regions (e.g. 'Thrace', 'Epirus', 'Thessalia', 'Hellas') and connected ethnic or tribal names (e.g. 'Vlachs', 'Albanians') as well as some supra-regional ethnonyms or geographical names of importance for the Balkans (e.g. 'Illyrioi', 'Romaioi', 'Europe').

In the following observations I shall inevitably touch on problems which might be treated in more detail by other speakers at the symposium. But I think that the danger of reiteration is negligible in view of the probable variety and differentiation of opinions. On the other hand, it is of course impossible to use and interpret all the pertinent sources for the Byzantine period within one lecture. So I have tried to find a reliable selection of historiographic texts. This selection is based in particular on two archives of the Austrian Academy of Sciences in Vienna: 1) the archive of Byzantine historical geography, which was established as an information base for the "Tabula Imperii Byzantini", the historical atlas of the Byzantine Empire, and 2) the prosopographical archive, based on Byzantine sources of the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries, the *Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palàologenzeit*. In order to avoid, as far as possible, unintentional omissions I have made a cross-check for the string 'μακεδ' in the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*.[1]

Before asking now about the main notions which the Byzantines have of Macedonia and the Macedonians as discernible in the written sources, and which of these interests could be helpful and offer answers to the question of Byzantine spatial thinking, we should at least mention that the period of the reign of Alexander the Great and his successors plays an important role for the late antique

---

εποχής· ΚΔ΄ Δημήτρια: Από της ιουστινιανείου εποχής έως και της μακεδονικής δυναστείας· ΚΕ΄ Δημήτρια: Από της εποχής των Κομνηνών μέχρι και της αλώσεως της Θεσσαλονίκης υπό των Οθωμανών (1430) (11ος – 15ος μ.Χ.) (Thessaloniki 1989, 1990, 1991, 1992); N.G.L. Hammond, *A History of Macedonia*, I: *Historical geography and prehistory*, II: *550–336 BC*, III: *336–167 BC* (Oxford 1972–1988); J. Koder, "Για μια εκ νέου τοποθέτηση της εφαρμογής της θεωρίας των κεντρικών τόπων: Το παράδειγμα της μεσοβυζαντινής Μακεδονίας" *Historical Geography. Roads and Crossroads of the Balkans from Antiquity to the European Union* ed. E.O. Dimitriadis, A.Ph. Lagopoulos & G. Tsotsos (Thessaloniki 1998) 33-49; id., "Οι όροι Ιλλυριός και Ιλλυρικόν στις ελληνικές πηγές της βυζαντινής εποχής," *ByzMak* 149–55; P.St. Koledarov, *Imeto Makedonija v istoričeskata geografija* (Sofia 1985); V. Kravari, *Villes et villages de Macédoine occidentale* (Paris 1989); J. Lefort, "Population et peuplement en Macédoine orientale, IXe–XVe siècle" *Hommes et richesses dans l'empire byzantin* II: *VIIIe–XVe siècle* ed. V. Kravari, J. Lefort & C. Morrisson (Paris 1991) 63–82, co-rapport by J.-M. Martin, 83–9; J. Lefort, *Villages de Macédoine: Notices historiques et topographiques sur la Macédoine orientale au Moyen Age* I: *La Chalcidique occidentale* (Paris 1982); Lemerle, *Philippes*; Vl. Popović, "Aux origines de la slavisation des Balkans: la constitution des premières sklavinies Macédoniennes à la fin du VIe siècle," *CRAI* (Paris 1980) 230–57; A.E. Vacalopoulos, *History of Macedonia 1354–1833* (Thessaloniki 1973).

1. CD-ROM produced by the University of California, Irvine, containing a corpus of ancient, patristic and early Byzantine Greek literature.

and medieval periodization of world history. The most common sequence of periodization in this type of historiographical setting is: Assyrian — Persian — Macedonian — Roman, a periodization which is well known from Eusebios onwards until the late Byzantine centuries[1] and which stresses the importance of the then contemporaneous Roman era[2] — which is sometimes, in an apocalyptic way, believed to be the last era before the *deutera parousia*, the Second Coming of Christ and the Last Judgement.[3]

The importance of the Macedonian era within this periodization relies on the legendary hero Alexander the Great, whose fame and glory were never forgotten in Byzantium. Alexander was a well known historical and legendary figure not only for the educated classes but for all strata of the Byzantine population, and this as early as the third century AD (Pseudo-Kallisthenes), when an unknown poet wrote the Alexander romance. Based on this important piece of literature, the fame of Alexander survived the Byzantine centuries and was even intensified in the late Byzantine period and the Tourkokratia.[4]

The basic spatial idea of Macedonia in this comprehensive view of world history, the ancient one, relies ultimately on the tradition of the Greek and Roman geographers who left this heritage to Byzantine geographers and their treatises. As an example of the latter I just quote the *Ethnika* of Stephanus Byzantinus, a contemporary of the emperor Justinian, who provides the specification 'Macedonian polis' for more than eighty towns reaching in the west as far as Epidamnos (Dyrrachion) and in the south even to Demetrias (near Volos)[5] in Thessaly.

This traditional extensive view of Macedonia is also reflected in the accounts of the divisions of the late Roman Empire. The pagan historian Zosimos (late fifth century), for example, describes the division of the Empire into four parts by Constantine the Great. According to Zosimos the second part includes among others the Macedonians, the Thessalians, the Cretans, Greece and the islands around

---

1. Examples: Eusebius, passim; Appian, *Ῥωμαϊκὴ ἱστορία*: Titles of *logos* 9 "Ῥωμαικῶν Μακεδονική" *logos* 10 "Ῥωμαικῶν Ἑλληνικὴ καὶ Ἰωνική" etc.; cf. Photios, *Bibl.* cod. 57; Zon. III 48.
2. E.g. *Suda* 'ρ' 246: Ῥωμαίων ἀρχή· αὕτη τῆς Ἀσσυρίων καὶ Περσῶν καὶ Μακεδόνων τῶν πρὶν μακρῷ ὑπερῆρεν, ...
3. E.g. George Monachos *Chronicon* ed. C. de Boor, revised P. Wirth (2 vols. Stuttgart 1978) 432f. See also his description of the Paulicians with the six symbolic names of the Paulician Churches (ibid. 720): 1. Makedonia, 2. Achaia, 3. Philippi 4. Laodikeia, 5. Ephesos, 6. Kolossai.
4. For the romance see U. Moennig, *Die spätbyzantinische Rezension *ζ des Alexanderromans* (*Neograeca Medii Aevi* 6, Cologne 1992); and in general L. Politis, *A History of Modern Greek Literature* (Oxford 1973) 33f.
5. Stephanos Byzantinos, *Ethnika* 788 s.v. 'Μακεδονίας πόλεις': 88 πόλεις, 4 χωρία, 3 ἔθνη, 8 χῶραι (the lemma 'Μακεδονία', 427f, is not helpful). For Epidamnos/Dyrrachion as a *polis* in Macedonia cf. *De them.* 2.9 (following Dexippos) and Kantak. I 115.

it, and finally both Epiruses.[1] The early Byzantine administration still maintained the ancient spatial tradition. The best contemporary sources for systematic information are the *Notitia Dignitatum*,[2] dating from the years between 425 and 430, and, of course, in the early sixth century the *Travellers Companion* by Hierokles, who provides us with something like a framework of administrative geography in the fifth century.[3] According to his description our region belonged to Illyricum and was divided — for a short time only — into two uneven parts: Makedonia A, with its capital Thessaloniki and some thirty other *poleis* (including the islands Thasos and Samothrace), and Makedonia B, with its capital Stobi, which included only seven other *poleis*, mostly in the region of Pelagonia (today's Bitola in the former Yugoslavian Macedonia).

Here we should at least mention also Prokopios, the famous historian of the sixth century, as an administrative source. He again gives us the traditional ancient geographical view of Macedonia in his catalogue of some forty fortresses built or restored by the emperor Justinian (or perhaps already by Anastasius).[4] But of course Prokopios stands also as a symbol of the Byzantine educated class, who never forgot the ancient meaning of Macedonia.[5]

The ancient notion seems in some way evidently contradictory to the other, new dimension of Macedonia, which was most common in Byzantium. The development of this new meaning of Macedonia seems to have its roots in the origins and the expansion of the well known administrative system of the so-called *themata*. The *themata* as military and administrative districts originated from a restructuring of the military organisation of Byzantium after the collapse of the empire's eastern frontier and the loss of Egypt, Palestine and Syria to the rapidly expanding Arab armies, who were inspired by the then young and aggressive religion of Islam.

The main changes happened in the second and third quarter of the seventh century, when the former Oriental and the former Armenian corps of the Byzantine army had to withdraw from the former eastern parts of the Roman (Byzantine)

---

1. Zosimos 2.33 (309f), cf. the German tr. by O. Veh & St. Rebenich, *Zosimos, Neue Geschichte* (*Bibl. Griech. Lit.* 31, Stuttgart 1990) 100, and the Eng. tr. by R.T. Ridley (*ByzAus* 2, Canberra 1982) 198, with commentary: 1. Egypt, Asia, Cyprus, some islands and Thrace (2.33.1), 2. Μακεδόνας καὶ Θεσσαλοὺς καὶ Κρῆτας καὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα καὶ τὰς περὶ αὐτὴν νήσους καὶ ἀμφοτέρας Ἠπείρους, καὶ πρὸς ταύταις Ἰλλυριοὺς and the entire Balkan peninsula, 3. Italy, Sicily, Libya and islands, 4. Gallia and Spain (2.33.2); similarly e.g. John Malalas 261, on the provincial organization in the time of Vespasian.
2. *NotDign* or. 1, 76 (*Macedonia*, under a *consularis*) and 125 (*Macedonia salutaris*, under a *praeses*).
3. Hierokles, *Synekdemos* 638–41 ed. Honigmann (Brussels 1939) 14–16.
4. Prokopios, *Buildings* 4.4.3 (catalogue of fortresses in Macedonia), 4.8.1 (summary).
5. One of many examples is the archbishop Theophylact of Ochrid, who described Thrace and Macedonia as: ... πᾶσαν τὴν Ἰλλυρίδα χώραν, τήν τε παλαιὰν Μακεδονίαν ἄχρι τῆς Θεσσαλονικέων πόλεως, in contrast to τά τε τῆς παλαιᾶς Θρᾴκης, τὰ περὶ τὴν Βερόην καὶ Φιλιππούπολιν, *Hist. martyrii XV martyrum* (PG 126) 89; cf. P. Soustal, *TIB* 6, 49f.

empire to Asia Minor and were assigned to defend this core of the empire. In this new task they were to be supported by the Thracian army corps, which was also transferred from its former position in Thrace to the southeastern parts of Asia Minor.[1] But the Byzantine emperors understood quickly how dangerous this deprivation of the European parts of their state was in view of the size and frequency of immigration and settlement by Slav tribes[2] in parts of the upland regions and, generally speaking, in the countryside since the last decades of the sixth century.

I just mention the climaxes of danger: the sieges of Thessaloniki by the Avars and Slavs in 586, at the beginning of the seventh century (604, 615/6, 618), and again in 676–8; the siege of Constantinople by the Avars and the Persians in 626, the five years (674–8) of continuous blockade of the Byzantine capital by Arab fleets; the attempt of the much debated Kouber who, in about 683, as a chieftain of the so-called 'Sirmesianoi' (a population of Thraco-Macedonian origin), tried to establish his own state; and finally the development of a quickly growing, independent Bulgarian state under Khan Asparuch after 678, a state which in its initial phase covered territory on both sides of the Danube river and included especially the former Byzantine provinces Scythia, Moesia II and Dacia.

Therefore the emperor Constantine IV (668–85) initiated the establishment of new armies in the hinterland of Constantinople in order to defend the capital and secure or regain the sovereignty over the southeastern parts of the Balkan peninsula. A first sign was the reorganisation of Thrace as the first new thematic district in Europe.[3] At the end of the seventh century Thrace covered only the very hinterland of Constantinople and the coastlands of the Sea of Marmara and the Black Sea up to Mesembria, the territory of the former Roman province of Europe, and it was not until the second half of the eighth century that the Byzantines gradually regained control over the regions up to Adrianople and the Hebros and Arda rivers.

In consequence it was only then, during the reign of the empress Eirene (797–802), that a new *thema* (a regular military district) named Macedonia was created, which appears first as a part (*tourma*) of Thrace, probably at the end of the eighth

---

1. Cf. R.-J. Lilie, "'Thrakien' und 'Thrakesion'. Zur byzantinischen Provinzorganisation am Ende des 7. Jahrhunderts" *JÖB* 26 (1977) 7–47.
2. Belegezitai, Drugubitai, Sagudatoi, Rynchines, Berzetoi and others, often with Hunnish or Iranian names, cf. O. Pritsak, "The Slavs and the Avars" *Gli Slavi occidentali e meridionali nell'alto medioevo I. Settimane Spoleto* 30 (1983) 353–435, see 402–5. For the situation in general cf. V. Papoulia, "Το πρόβλημα της ειρηνικής διεισδύσεως των Σλάβων στην Ελλάδα" *ByzMak* 255–65.
3. One of the participants of the 6th Oecumenical Council was the *hypostrategos* of Thrace, Theodoros.

century.[1] This development is corroborated by administrative sources, which mention separate governors for both regions.[2]

The main tasks of the Macedonian army in the ninth and tenth centuries were first to regain control over land in which the Slavs had settled after their immigration in the previous centuries, and second to defend Byzantine territory in Macedonia (and indirectly also Constantinople) against aggressors from the Balkans, mainly the Bulgarians. This is stated very clearly by one of the anonymous historians who continued the chronicle of Theophanes; he explains that the commanders of Thrace and Macedonia had to support the so-called 'Anatolian' army, the Byzantine army in Asia minor, only so long as the Bulgars kept the peace.[3] The so-called 'Turks' (at this period a name for the Hungarians) are mentioned as another enemy in the Balkans who raided the region in the times of Romanos II.[4] But Macedonian soldiers also fought on other fronts, for example against the Slav tribes in the Peloponnese.[5]

How far did the territory of Byzantine Macedonia extend? For the early period, the Arab geographers Ibn Khurdādhbih and Ibn al-Fāqih, both writing at the beginning of the tenth century and relying on information from the second half of the ninth century, describe our region in a very clear manner. Both mention the hinterland of Constantinople as far as the *makra teiche* (the long walls) with the name Ṭāflā.[6] These "long walls" protected the capital for a length of about 45 km between the Black Sea and Selymbria, at a mean distance of some 65 km from

---

1. Theoph. AM 6294 (de Boor 475) mentions in the year 801/2 a *monostrategos* of Thrace and Macedonia (μονοστράτηγος εἵς τε τὴν Θρᾴκην καὶ Μακεδονίαν) in clear contrast to the περατικὰ θέματα of the Anatolikoi and Opsikion. A seal of the same time provides evidence for a *spatharios* and *tourmarches* of Macedonia (Zacos, *Seals* I no. 2147) whereas in 813 a separate *patrikios* and *strategos* of Macedonia is mentioned in Theoph. AM 6305 (de Boor 501).
2. In the middle (842–3) and in the end (899) of the ninth century the *patrikios kai strategos Makedonias* ranks immediately after the *strategos Thrakes* and belongs to the first class of titles, namely the *strategoi* (Oikonomides, *Listes* 49 = *Taktikon* Uspenskij 101, 105 = Philotheos). In 899 both are also entitled *anthypatoi* (Oikonomides, *Listes* 139). Both regions were then divided into several *tourmai*, because even the elder list mentions the commanders of these subdivisions, the *tourmarchai*, in the plural (Oikonomides, *Listes* 57). The *strategos Makedonias* is still mentioned in the times of Romanos Lakapenos (934–44) (Oikonomides, *Listes* 247 = *Taktikon* Beneševič), but not in the Escorial *Taktikon*, dated between 971 and 975, though he appears again in an inscription in the year 1006/7. This omission should perhaps not be explained by a simple mistake but by the fact that in the Escorial *Taktikon* there appears a *dux* of Adrianople, then capital of Macedonia, following in the list immediately after the *dux* of Thessaloniki (Oikonomides, *Listes* 263, 355).
3. Reign of Michael III: *TheophCont* 4.25 (Bekker 181).
4. *TheophCont* 6 Romanos 15 (Bekker 480); remarkably, the *patrikios* Marianos Argyros was μονοστρατηγοῦντος ἐν τῷ θέματι τῆς Μακεδονίας καὶ κατεπάνω ὄντος τῆς δύσεως.
5. Cf. *De adm. imp.* 50.9ff.
6. That Ṭāflā is another name for the μακρὰ τείχη seems clear, though the etymology is disputed: a toponym Tarfa or Greek τάφρος or τὰ ἐν αὐλῇ or αὔλαξ etc., cf. *De them.* (Pertusi 160-2).

Constantinople.[1] To the west of Ṭāflā, following the Arab geographers, two provinces were directly attached:

a) Further north was the province of Tarāqiya (Thrace), which reached north to the "sea of the Chazars" (the Black Sea), west to the land of the Burğ an (the Bulgars), and south to the province of Maqadūniya (Macedonia).

b) To the south they describe the province of Maqadūniya, again with the limits of the *makra teiche* and Thrace but reaching south as far as the "sea of al-Sham" (the 'Syrian' sea, i.e. the Aegean) and west to the districts of the "Sakaliba" (the Slavs). They also inform us that the main fortress is called "al-Bandus" (perhaps a miswriting of Adrianople) and that Maqadūniya was in length a fifteen-day journey and in breadth one of five days.[2]

The information from Arab geographers is corroborated by the administrative structure of the church and by Byzantine historical sources. In the catalogues of bishoprics of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, the so-called *Notitiae episcopatuum*, the metropolitan see of Macedonia is, from the beginning of the ninth century, Philippi.[3] Another example is in the chronicle of Theophanes, which mentions a submarine earthquake in the Aegean which caused damage in Abydos and in parts of τῆς πρὸς θάλασσαν Μακεδονίας,[4] thus indicating how far to the east the name Macedonia was applicable in the early eighth century; and still in the eleventh century, Michael Attaleiates speaks about Rhaidestos, Panion and Myriophyton as *poleis* in Macedonia.[5]

From the beginning of the eleventh century, however, the geographical name shifts to the west again and also regains, from the administrative point of view, an enlarged significance. A document from 1042, preserved in the monastery of Iveron on Mt. Athos, mentions for the first time a single province named "Boleron, Strymon and Thessaloniki".[6] The above-mentioned Michael Attaleiates (eleventh century) and Anna Komnene, daughter of the emperor Alexios I, describe the Zygos (or Haimos) range respectively as the northern frontier of Macedonia and Thrace. To the south lies the region of *Makedonike*, where the Macedonians live, and to the north the region of the Istros-river, the Danube, inhabited by Dacians.[7] Consequently Anna Komnene also mentions Philippoupolis as a *polis* in

1. M. Whitby, "The Long Walls of Constantinople," *Byz* 55 (1985) 560–83.
2. *De them.* (Pertusi 162-4); Soustal, *TIB* 6 49f. If we calculate a day's journey at 20–30 km, the "length" would correspond to the distance from the Long Walls to the river Strymon, and the "breadth" to the distance from the coastal area to Adrianople, then the capital of Macedonia.
3. *Notitiae CP* 2.41, 7.614, 9.487, 10.577, 13.626, 14.42, 15.39, 20.39, 21.157.
4. Theoph. AM 6218 (AD 726) (de Boor 404).
5. Attal. 89–90.
6. It is testified until 1198: *Ivir.* 245; Tafel-Thomas I 264, 278.
7. Attal. 37; An.Komn. 14.8.6.; for the Haimos cf. P. Soustal, *TIB* 6 279f.

Macedonia.[1] It is noteworthy that 'Macedonians' in this source indicates merely the geographical association of inhabitants, without an ethnic dimension.[2]

In our context it is important to emphasize that Byzantine cosmographical thought, with its traditional mentality, was fixed on the *Nea Romē* (the 'New Rome', Constantinople) as the very centre, and therefore all regions which belonged to the empire were seen in their geographical relation to this centre.[3] On this basis, the first region in Europe was Thrace, the immediately neighbouring region which surrounded the capital in a semicircle to the northwest and west; and the second semicircle was Macedonia. Both regions were closely connected to each other by their common fate in Byzantine history: for example, the devastations during the previous Bulgarian war had the consequence of the emperor Leo V (813–20) being obliged to rebuild the towns all over Thrace and Macedonia completely from his own resources (ἀνεγείρων ... πόλεις πολλαχοῦ τῶν κατὰ Θρᾴκην καὶ Μακεδονίαν δι' ἑαυτοῦ ἐκ βάθρων).[4]

As a further consequence, Thrace and Macedonia were not only geographically and politically closer to each other than the other parts of the Byzantine empire but also closer in the mentality and spatial thought of Byzantine writers; for this fact there exists plenty of documentation.[5] Thrace and Macedonia were so close to each other in the Byzantine imagination that the following statement about Basil I, the founder of the Macedonian dynasty, was possible: "He departed from Thracian Macedonia and reached this city (sc. Constantinople) which rules over all cities" ("Αρας οὖν ἐκ Μακεδονίας τῆς Θρᾴκης πρὸς τὴν ἄρχουσαν ταύτην τῶν πόλεων πασῶν ἐπορεύετο).[6]

Adrianople is testified as the capital (metropolis) of Macedonia as early as the fifth century by the church historian Socrates, who is well aware of the contradiction, speaking elsewhere also about τῆς ἐν Θρᾴκῃ Ἀδριανουπόλεως, ἣ ἐν τοῖς ὁρίοις τῆς Μακεδονίας ἐστίν.[7] This can be explained partially also by

1. An.Komn. 7.2.1.
2. Both historians, of course, do not mention a Bulgarian state, as they describe the political situation after the cataclysmic wars at the end of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh century, which ended with the victory of Basil II Bulgaroktonos and the (re)integration of the former independent Bulgarian territories in the Byzantine empire.
3. A good example of the byzantine cosmographical view is to be found at George Pachymeres' description of the Black Sea, see A. Laiou, "On political geography: the Black Sea of Pachymeres" *The Making of Byzantine History. Studies dedicated to Donald M. Nicol* ed. Roderick Beaton and Charlotte Roueché (Aldershot 1993) 94–121.
4. *TheophCont* 1.19 (Bekker 30).
5. Cf. e.g. Theoph. AM 6294 (AD 802) (de Boor 475): The *themata* Thrace and Macedonia, in contrast with the περατικὰ θέματα (in Asia Minor); Genesios passim; Leo Diac. 111; Leo Grammatikos 236; Skyl. 531; *SkylCont* 115, 166 (Bulgaria, Thrace and Macedonia); Zon. passim, e.g. III 713f: τὰ τῶν Θρᾳκῶν τε καὶ τῶν Μακεδόνων ληίζεται (sc. the dux of Paristrion) καὶ ὅσα τούτοις τῆς Βουλγαρίας παράκειναι; Nik.Chon. passim; George Pachymeres (Bekker II 492f); Greg. passim; Kantak. I 326, II 162, 180f; Michael Kritoboulos 2.17.2.
6. *TheophCont* 5.9 (223).
7. Sok., *HE* 4.38.25, cf. 4.38.3.

the fact that until the beginning of iconoclasm the churches of Illyricum and Greece (including Thessaloniki, the see of the papal vicar) were — at least formally — under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Pope in Rome. Adrianople held the position as administrative and military centre of Macedonia at any rate until the twelfth century, as is testified by many authors.[1]

On the other hand the Byzantine historians were aware of the prominent position of Thessaloniki as *prote Makedonon*; as one example I mention again the same church historian Socrates.[2] But, as mentioned above, Thessaloniki, as well as Strymon, was a *thema* in its own right in the early middle ages, and its hinterland therefore — unhistorically — was even named "Thessaly". Thessaly has survived as the name of the ecclesiastical province of Thessaloniki ("eparchia Thessalias" or "Thettalias") since the beginning of the tenth century.[3]

In the late Byzantine period the holy monastic mountain Papikion,[4] near Christoupolis (the modern Kavala)[5] was considered as the exact borderline between Macedonia and Thrace. The provinces from west of Kavala to the Adriatic coastline had the collective name *hesperiai eparchiai*[6] ('western provinces') or *dysis pasa* ('all the west').

The southern frontier with Thessaly (the real Thessaly) was marked by the mountain-chains of Olympus, Ossa and Pelion, as Nikephoros Gregoras confirms.[7] But when Byzantine historians speak without specification about the regions to the south of Macedonia, they ordinarily use the term 'Hellas'.[8]

If we recapitulate, we find — in spite of repeated shifts — all through the Byzantine period clear distinctions between Macedonia and the adjacent areas of Illyrikon, Bulgaria and Serbia to the north, Thessaly, Hellas (also "Achaia") and the Peloponnese to the south, Epirus and Dalmatia to the west, and Thrace to the east. These distinctions have their origins, as has already been demonstrated, in the classical tradition, but they rely also on the administrative boundaries of the Roman and Byzantine empire, which lasted for centuries.

It is, however, a peculiarity of Byzantine texts that they often use ethnonyms instead of geographical names (and less often the reverse). Therefore a careful

---

1. Cf. e.g. George Monachos (PG 110 col. 981); Symeon Magistros 686; Attal. 33, 284; Zon. III 626f.
2. Sok., *HE* 2.16.22 (τὴν Μακεδονίας μητρόπολιν Θεσσαλονίκην); cf. also Kameniates 3 (Becker 490) et passim.
3. *Notitiae CP* 7.296, 8.17, 9.182, 10.215, 13.223, 14.19, 20.16, 21.95.
4. Παπίκιον ... ὄρος ἱερὸν μεταξὺ κείμενον Θράκης καὶ Μακεδονίας (Philotheos, *Enkomion in Greg. Palamas* 562).
5. Greg. I 246, 254f.
6. ... τῶν ἀπό Χριστουπόλεως Μακεδονικῶν τε καὶ ἑσπερίων ἐπαρχιῶν ἄχρις Ἐπιδάμνου καὶ Δαλματίας (Kantak. I 115).
7. Greg. I 247f.
8. Sok., *HE* 5.22.161 (ἐν Θεσσαλονίκῃ καὶ αὐτῇ Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ Ἑλλάδι); Sozom., *HE* 1.2.2.7 (οἱ δὲ ἀνὰ τὴν δύσιν Ἕλληνές τε καὶ Μακεδόνες καὶ Ἰλλυριοὶ ...); Theoph. AM 5870 (AD 370) (de Boor 65): Thrace, Macedonia, Achaia and all Hellas; Zon. III 678. More specific is the *Chronicle of Monemvasia* l. 14f and 35f (ed. Lemerle 9): Thracians and Macedonians (in contrast to Thessaly, Hellas etc.)

interpretation of sources according to their context is necessary to avoid misunderstanding. When, for example, the Church historian Sozomenos (fifth century) relates that Δαρδάνιοί τε καὶ Μακεδόνες καὶ ὅσοι περὶ τὸν Ἴστρον οἰκοῦσιν, ἥ τε καλουμένη Ἑλλὰς καὶ πᾶν τὸ Ἰλλυριῶν ἔθνος ὑπὸ Κωνσταντῖνον ἐγένοντο,[1] or when the deacon Leo (tenth century) describes the χώρα, ἣν ὁ Ἴστρος ἐντὸς Μακεδόνων περιορίζει,[2] this does not mean an ethnic distinction but merely the provenance of representatives from different areas.

On the other hand, when the chronographer Theophanes describes how in 758 the emperor Constantine V subjugated τὰς κατὰ τὴν Μακεδονίαν Σκλαυινίας ('the Slavonias in Macedonia'),[3] it is impossible to deny that the geographic name also implies an ethnic distinction. And this distinction seems to be clear when the political insider Kekaumenos explains in the eleventh century that the Vlachs are spread over Epirus and Macedonia but that most of them live in Hellas.[4] Kekaumenos and (some fifty years later) Anna Komnene[5] assure us of the political affinity between the Vlachs and the Bulgarians, and Niketas Choniates is still able to confirm this association indirectly still nearly a century later: "The deserted lands of Haimos and the pillage of Macedonia and Thrace", he says, "bear clearer witness to this than any memorial or historical account."[6]

The notion of special military entities in Thrace and Macedonia, which derived from the administrative system of the themes, changed through the centuries but did not disappear until the end of the Byzantine empire, although this seems only to be reflected in vague resonances in late medieval accounts. When, for example, the young emperor Andronikos III at the beginning of 1328, during the civil war against his grandfather, assembled troops against the czar of the Bulgars, Michael Šišman, the contemporary former emperor and historian John Kantakouzenos mentions the following subdivisions of the army: 1) the troops from the "West", 2) the Macedonians and Thracians, and 3) the troops from the "eastern" cities (i.e. in Asia Minor).[7]

---

1. "... Dardanians and Macedonians and all those living in the Danube region, what is known as Greece, and all the Illyrian people came under the rule of Konstantinos", cf. Sozom., *HE* 1.6.6.2, cf. 7.4.4.1 περὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐθνῶν μέχρι μὲν Μακεδόνων.
2. "... the land, which the Danube circumscribes inside the Macedonians", cf. Leo Diac, 104. Another example is in the *Miracles* of Demetrios, which speak about an assembly of Μακεδόνες, Θετταλοί and Ἀχαοί in Thessaloniki (Lemerle I 137).
3. Theoph. AM 6250 (de Boor 430).
4. Kekaum. 187 (Wassiliewsky 74).
5. An.Komn. 3.4 (ed. Leib & Gautier II 135).
6. Μαρτυροῦσιν ἐκ δήπου τὰ πεπραγμένα ἡ τῶν πρὸς Αἷμον χωρῶν ἐρημία, Μακεδονίας τε καὶ Θρᾴκης οἱ λῃϊσμοὶ στηλῶν καὶ κύρβεων ἀκριβέστερον καὶ ξυμπάσης ἱστορίας τρανότερον (Nik.Chon. 473).
7. ...ἐκ τῆς ἑσπέρας πᾶσα παρῆν (sc. στρατιά), καὶ Μακεδόνες καὶ Θρᾴκες, καὶ ὅσοι ἐκ τῶν κατὰ τὴν ἕω τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις ὑπηκόων πόλεων ἦσαν (Kantak. I 326). Another grouping, though, is attested some years earlier, when the co-emperor Michael IX went to war against the Catalan Company in 1305 near Apros. The catalogue of his troops included 1) Alanoi and Turkopuloi (both probably mercenaries), 2) Makedones and Anatolikoi ('ἀντολίηθεν'), perhaps still regular soldiers from the

An overlapping and harmonization of the two notions described above — the traditional ancient and the 'thematic' Byzantine — began approximately at the time when a third notion appeared that was appropriate to strengthen anew the ancient aspect of the military and political power of the Macedonians. This third notion is connected with the legendary origin of the so-called "Macedonian dynasty".[1] The founder of the dynasty, the later emperor Basil I, γεννᾶται ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ ἐν τοῖς χωρίοις Ἀδριανουπόλεως ('He was born in Macedonia, in [one of] the villages around Adrianople').[2]

With the seizure of power is also connected another facet of *Makedon*, which leads to the important question about the image of the Macedonians and their prestige in the Byzantine period: the role of the Macedonians as members of the military guard, as bodyguards and trusted persons of the emperors, especially those of the so-called Μακεδόνες τῆς μεγάλης ἑταιρείας.[3] The reputation of these 'Macedonians of the Great Company' is generally high in the era of the Macedonian emperors, from the end of the ninth to the middle of the eleventh century, and the fact that the emperor Nikephoros Phocas entrusted a group of patricians with the command over the "Macedonian phalanx"[4] must be interpreted as a sign of confidence in these persons. After the end of the Macedonian dynasty, in the eleventh century and later, the fame of the Macedonians became ambivalent.

The famous and multi-talented Michael Psellos (eleventh century), followed by John Zonaras[5] and others, when describing the riot of Leo Tornikios against the last Macedonian emperor Constantine IX Monomachos in 1047, draws a dark picture of the Macedonians and their behaviour: οἱ δὲ πλείους τῶν Μακεδόνων, δῆμος ὄντες αὐθαδείᾳ χαίροντες καὶ θρασύτητι, καὶ οὐ στρατηγικῆς ἀφελείας ἀλλὰ πολιτικῆς βωμολοχίας ὄντες ἐθάδες ... χορείας εἰς τοὐμφανὲς συνιστῶντες, αὐτοσχεδίους ἐποιοῦντο κωμῳδίας τῷ αὐτοκράτορι ... They are, so the historian asserts, stubborn and bold, not accustomed to military simplicity but to the buffoonery of the capital.[6] Consequently, their leader Leo Tornikios is in his eyes a man who "has his home in Adrianople and belches out Macedonian boastfulness" (τὴν Ἀδριανούπολιν οἰκῶν καὶ Μακεδονικὴν ἐρυγγάνων μεγαλαυχίαν).[7] It seems clear that Psellos personally did not like the Macedonians very much.

European hinterland of Constantinople and from Bithynia, and 3) Vlachoi and other volunteers ('θελητάριοι'): George Pachymeres 6 (Bekker II 549), cf. *PLP* no. 21529.

1. For this cf. Gy. Moravcsik, "Sagen und Legenden über Kaiser Basileios I" *DOP* 15 (1961) 59–126.
2. George Monachos Cont., *Theophanes Continuatus, Ioannes Cameniata, Symeon Magister, Georgius Monachus* ed. I. Bekker (Bonn 1838) 817.
3. *De cer.* 576; cf. 'Hetaireia', ODB II (1991) 925.
4. Leo Diac. 3.8 (Hase 45f): Marianos, Paschalios and the Tornikioi ἑταιρισάμενος καὶ Μακεδονικὴν αὐτοῖς ἐγχειρίσας φάλαγγα.
5. Zon. 17.23.24 (III 628f).
6. Psellos, *Chron.* 6.110.
7. Psellos, *Chron.* 6.99.

The reconciliation of these two notions — the ancient, which subconsciously always implicated the image of Alexander the Great and his conquests, and the 'thematic', which also originated in a military background — together with the legendary origin of the Macedonian dynasty (with the connotation of the Macedonian members of the imperial court, the *megale etaireia*) had resulted almost automatically in the Byzantine image of the Macedonians being par excellence warriors with an ancient tradition of heroism, men who preferred action to discussion.

The anthologies of ancient authors and historians collected by Byzantine scholars in the first half of the tenth century by order of Constantine Porphyrogennetos,[1] the third emperor of the Macedonian dynasty, quote for example Polybius, who asserts that the Macedonians are not used to democratic and corporate government (συνέβαινε γὰρ τοὺς Μακεδόνας ἀήθεις ὄντας δημοκρατικῆς καὶ συνεδριακῆς πολιτείας).[2] Polybius, the historian of the rise of the Roman Empire, speaks about the ancient Macedonians, of course, but he is still quoted in the tenth century.[3] The same anthology quotes an important speech by Kallisthenes, the nephew of Aristotle, to Alexander the Great: "He, Alexander, should act in a manner that allowed Hellenes and Macedonians to honour him in a Hellenic way and only barbarians in a barbaric way"[4] — by 'barbaric way' he means *proskynesis*. The anthologist gives the reader, a member of the imperial family, to understand that the Macedonians despite all their distinctions from the Hellenes in a narrower sense, still belong to them and are clearly differentiated from all other people and tribes.

In the late Byzantine period, and especially during the reign of the Palaiologan dynasty, we observe an increase in the importance of Macedonia for the Byzantine empire. This increase begins already as early as the end of the eleventh century when, as an aftermath of the battle of Mantzikert (1071), the first (though temporary) loss of great parts of Asia Minor to the new Seljuq states causes a significant loss of grain cultivating areas. As a consequence the capital accommodated itself, after some difficult years of famine, to new production- and market-areas in the European parts of the empire.

Characteristically the archbishop of Athens, Michael Choniates, writes at the end of the twelfth century in a letter: "O effeminate people of Constantinople! ... What are you short of? Are not the wheat-bearing plains of Macedonia, Thrace and Thessaly cultivated for you, are not the grapes from Euboea and Pteleon, from

1. For more information on the notion of 'Makedon(ia)' in these sources of the 'Macedonian Renaissance' cf. J. Koder, "Mazedonien in Quellen der Mazedonischen Dynastie" *Synodia. Studi in onore di Antonio Garzya* (Naples 1997) 67–88.
2. Const. Porph., *De leg.* 338, quoting Polybius 31.12.
3. Also it might not be by chance that another anthology of the same so-called 'Macedonian Renaissance' recalls the saying of king Lysimachos, that the *makedonikon deipnon* is *basilikoteron* than the *thrakion* (Const. Porph., *De sent.* 345).
4. Const. Porph., *De sent.* 60f.

Chios and Rhodes, trodden for you?"[1] The deeper sense of these words was basically valid from the beginning of the twelfth century onwards: Constantinople imported more and more cereals and other important victuals (for example salt[2]) from the Balkans, and particularly from Thessaly, Macedonia and Thrace. The production of wheat and barley was so important that the emperor Andronikos II imposed a new, additional tax in kind, with the characteristic name *sitokrithon*, upon "the land of the Macedonians and all the West", as George Pachymeres informs us,[3] when, in the last years of the thirteenth century, the remaining Byzantine provinces in Asia Minor suffered from Turkish raids and the population sought refuge on the European side of the Hellespont.

In the late period Macedonia thus becomes still more important for the Byzantine empire.[4] Byzantine scholars and historians are better acquainted with the land, even geographically. Nikephoros Gregoras remarks, rather incidentally that the Strymon is the most important river not only in Macedonia but also in Thrace and in general in the south of the Balkan Peninsula.[5] Also, the names of many *poleis* and *choria* are known from written sources. The index of names in the "Prosopographical Lexicon of the Palaiologan Era", which by no means has a complete inventory of Byzantine place-names, comprises approximately 800 'Macedonian' toponyms. Particularly noteworthy is, for example, the topographical knowledge of Macedonia in the *History* of John Kantakouzenos.[6]

On the other hand, the frontiers of what in the sources is called 'Macedonia' are rather vague and thus a pertinent geographical description, as seen again from the centre Constantinople, could be simply: a broad belt of land from the hinterland of Constantinople and the Marmara Sea along the northern coast of the Aegean as far as the Adriatic coast in the West. In 1305 the commander of the so-called 'Grand Catalan Company', Berenguer of Rocafort, then possessing a piece of land between Gallipoli and Rhaidestos, proclaimed by his seal of office the rule of "the army of the Franks over the Kingdom of Macedonia".[7]

---

1. ... ὦ τρυφεροὶ τῆς Κωνσταντίνου πολῖται! ... Τίνος γὰρ καὶ σπανίζετε; Οὐ Μακεδονίας καὶ Θρᾴκης καὶ Θετταλίας πυροφόροι πεδιάδες ὑμῖν γεωργοῦνται, οὐχ ὑμῖν ληνοβατεῖται οἶνος ὁ Εὐβοεὺς καὶ Πτελεατικὸς καὶ Χῖος καὶ Ῥόδιος, Michael Choniates in a letter to the *protasekretis* Demetrios Drimys, no. 50 8–10, *Μιχαὴλ Ἀκομινάτου τοῦ Χωνιάτου τὰ σωζόμενα* ed. Sp. Lampros (Athens 1879) II 83.
2. From the salt-pits near Ainos; see Michael Kritoboulos 2.12.7.
3. Pachymer. 6.8 (Bekker II 492f).
4. Cf. A. Laiou, "Η Θεσσαλονίκη, η ενδοχώρα της και ο οικονομικός της χώρος στην εποχή των Παλαιολόγων" *ByzMak* 183–94.
5. Greg. I 375.
6. Kantak. 1.23 (Schopen I 115), 54 (275), 2.28 (II 548–551), 3.89 (III 31f.), 4.4 (148), 20f (155f). As the region now was in general seen as a central part of the empire, it seems to be a special case that in 1333 Syrgiannis, by this time a subdued insurgent, asked the emperor for a patch of land "somewhere in Macedonia, in the furthermost frontiers of the Romaic territory" (Greg. I 489).
7. Cf. Nicol, *Last Centuries* 140.

In the course of the middle ages the population of Macedonia became multiethnic and multicultural, though its integration into orthodox and Byzantine culture in general is without doubt. As the ethnological problems are not a main concern of my paper, I just mention the presence of the Bulgarian state from the ninth century until 1018 and again in the thirteenth century; the Vlachs, who lived as nomads all over the southern Balkan peninsula and at times were politically linked with the Bulgarians in the middle Byzantine centuries; the Gypsies;[1] and the Serbian presence between 1282 and the battle of the Field of Kossovo (in 1389).[2] An interesting case is mentioned, for example, in the early thirteenth century by the famous archbishop of Ochrid, Demetrios Chomatenos († c. 1236), who in a *responsio* (an expert juridical opinion) mentions a man named Ἰωάννης ὁ ἐπιλεγόμενος μὲν Ἱερακάρης, γαμβρὸς δὲ τοῦ Βλαστηνοῦ τοῦ Ῥάδου, τὸ δὲ γένος ἕλκων ἐκ Μακεδόνων.[3] From the context of the document there is no doubt that in the thirteenth century this man was an orthodox Christian, spoke Greek and regarded himself as a 'Romaios', but his in-laws were clearly Slav.

Southern Macedonia was still under Byzantine control in the first half of the forteenth century, since the Frankish occupation after the Fourth Crusade (Boniface of Montferrat, † 1207) lasted only a few years, and even the Catalan threat was averted.[4]

It was the civil war between the two emperors Andronikos, the grandfather and the grandson, which brought severe difficulties for the country. Already in 1321 the young emperor claimed from his grandfather the administration of all land between

---

1. For the Gypsies cf. I. Rochow & Kl.-P. Matschke, "Neues zu den Zigeunern im Byzantinischen Reich um die Wende vom 13. zum 14. Jahrhundert" *JÖB* 41 (1991) 241–54. See also the interesting note (to be dated 1203 or earlier) in the *Cod. Vat. gr.* 130, speaking about ... ἐν τῇ Μακεδονία οὖσι κλέπταις τοῖς λεγομένοις Αἰγυπτίοις, οὗτοι γὰρ κλέπτοντες καὶ εὑρισκόμενοι, οὐκ ἀπαρνῶνται ἀλλ' ὁμολογοῦντες, ζητοῦσι τὸν ἐπὶ κλεψία μισθὸν αὐτῶν, ὃν καλοῦσι παλικαριατικόν. Cf. C.M. Mazzucchi, "Leggere i classici durante la catastrofe (Costantinopoli, maggio – agosto 1203): le note marginali al Diodoro Siculo Vaticano gr. 130" *Aevum* 68 (1994) 164–218, esp. 182.
2. Cf. now the bibliographical survey from G. Mintses, "Ξενικές εγκαταστάσεις στη μεσαιωνική Μακεδονία (το πρόβλημα των σλαβικών εποικισμών στη διεθνή βιβλιογραφία)" *Byzantiaka* 15 (1995) 155–76.
3. Resp. 72 in Chom. (Pitra 315f); cf. I.Ch. Tarnanides, *Στα βόρεια της Μακεδονίας* (Thessaloniki 1992) (I am grateful to I. Leontiades, Thessaloniki, who drew my attention to this source).
4. As we are told by Nikephoros Gregoras, the so-called Catalan Company conquered parts of eastern Macedonia in 1307 and built a fortified camp near Kassandria as a base for their campaigns in all Macedonia. But the byzantine emperor inhibited their return to Thrace by a quickly built wall near Kavala, and so — in fear of starvation and of the people adjacent to the Romans, τὰ τοῖς ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ Ῥωμαίοις ὁμοροῦντα ἔθνη, the Illyrians, Triballes, Acamanians and Thessalians (Greg. I 244ff, esp. 247) — they decided to migrate to the southern parts of Greece in 1308. For the byzantine administrative tradition see L.J. Maksimović, "Η Μακεδονία μεταξύ της λατινικής και σερβικής κατακτήσεως (το πρόβλημα της συνέχειας του βυζαντινού διοικητικού συστήματος)" *ByzMak* 195–207.

Selymbria and Christoupolis, and offered in return to the elder Andronikos the reign over Constantinople and its hinterland up to Selymbria, the cities in the east, and the Macedonian and western provinces from Christoupolis to Epidamnos and Dalmatia.[1] From this year until the end of the civil wars Macedonia was continuously the focus of Byzantine politics, in which the Bulgarian and the increasing Serbian influence at times was undeniable.[2]

A further dynamization of political development came from the renewed Serbian expansion to the south, which began as early as 1282, when Stefan Milutin captured Skopje, and reached its peak during the reign of the czar Stefan Dušan (1331–55), doubtless a winner of the civil war between John Kantakouzenos and the Palaiologan party. During this war the czar managed to conquer large parts of Byzantine Greece. After his conquest of Serres (in 1345) Stefan Dušan held sway over all Macedonia, with the exception of Thessaloniki and the western part of the Chalkidike peninsula, and proclaimed himself emperor of the Serbs and the Romaioi (his coronation by the newly established Serbian Patriarch took place on Easter Sunday, 1346). At the same time Thessaloniki still flourished as a centre of Byzantine commerce and culture, in spite of the Zealots' rule from 1342 to 1349, and even became a centre of legal studies.[3] The forteenth century and especially the epoch of Stefan Dušan is characterized by an intensified Byzantinization of Serbian art, education and culture, a development which on the other hand ensured the continuous dominance of Byzantine culture in Macedonia.[4]

The emperor John VI Kantakouzenos, in his *History*, gives a detailed account of the dramatic development of Serbian territorial policy and the Byzantine response. After his victory over the Palaiologan party during the civil war he tried to recover at least a part of the Serbian acquisitions. The Macedonian territory was so important for both the emperor and the czar that once the *krales ton Tribalon* (Stefan Dušan) even proposed to the emperor a partition of Macedonian territory.[5]

But this policy was ephemeral as the Turkish threat was imminent. Already in 1352 Suleiman captured Tzympe and a little later, in 1354, after a terrible earthquake, Gallipoli. So the doors to the Balkan peninsula were wide open and hardly one generation later, in 1373, Adrianople was to become the residence of Murad I and to remain the European capital of the Osmans until 1453. Our

---

1. Kantak. 1.23 (Schopen I 115).
2. Cf. *TIB* 6 111ff.
3. I just mention that within only one decade two juridical handbooks were written here: in 1335 the *Syntagma* of canon and civil law by the monk Matthew Blastares, and in 1345 the famous *Hexabiblos* by the judge and *nomophylax* Const. Harmenopoulos, both with strong influence on the christian jurisdiction during the period of Tourkokratia.
4. Cf. *TIB* 6, 117ff; Soulis, *Dušan*.
5. He provided for the Byzantines Akarnania, Thessaly, the towns of Serbia, Veroia, Edessa, Gynaikokastron, Mygdonia with the inhabitated *poleis* as well as the *komai* in the Strymon region, which also bore the name 'Tantesanou Mountains', as far as the border of Pherai, whereas the Serbs were to get Zichna, Pherai, Melenikon, Strymbitza, Kastoria "and the other Macedonian *komai* and *polichnai* beyond the mentioned frontiers" (Kantak. 4.21, Schopen III 155f);. cf. G. Soulis, op. cit., esp. 40ff.

information on the first phase of Turkish occupation of Macedonia is rather inaccurate. It began between 1383 and 1387, reached its peak when Thessaloniki surrendered,[1] and lasted until the Turkish disaster in the battle of Ankyra in 1402. What followed was merely a short Byzantine and Venetian intermezzo. In 1430 Murad II finally, after a brief siege, conquered Thessaloniki. As Michael Kritoboulos, a historian of the end of Byzantium, puts it, in Greece the Turks devastated in a short time all Thrace and Macedonia and subjugated "the Illyrians, Triballoi, Greeks and many other peoples" in the interior regions as well as by the coast.[2] So, we are finally confronted again with two main characteristics of Byzantine understanding of Macedonia: its exceptional proximity to Thrace within the Greek cultural space, and the multiethnic origin and character of its population.

But I would like to close with some verses from Kostis Palamas, verses which express in a beautiful manner the reconciliation of the multiethnicity and the dominance of Byzantine-Greek culture:

Μα ή ρωμιογέννητοι, ή ρωμιοί, ή τουρκόσποροι, μιά πίστη,
και γλώσσα μιά, και ιδέα μιά, και μιά ψυχή· ένα Γένος.
Κοπρίσματα, ανεμορριπές, κλαδέματα, πλημμύρες
σταλώσανε ή λυγίσανε το δέντρο· δεν τ' αλλάξαν. ...
Κι από την Ανδριανόπολη, τη χώρα τη μεγάλη
σολντάτοι, της Νικόπολης, του Δυρραχιού, της Άρτας,
κι αφέντες απ' την Έγριπο κι απ' τα νησιά δουκάδες.
παιδόπουλα, αρχοντόπουλα. Και της Θεσσαλονίκης
βλαστοί, πρωτοπαλλήκαρα, και πολεμάρχοι, μέσα
κι από τη γη που ιέρισσα και καπετάνισσα είναι,
στόνα της χέρι το σπαθί και στ' άλλο το βαγγέλιο,
και του πελάου και στεριανή, και στο ρωμαίικο Γένος
αφρός από τη δόξα του κι από τη δύναμή του.
Μακεδονίτες ποταμοί, μακεδονίτες άντρες
ανταμωμένοι απάνου της θεριεύουνε και στέκουν ...[3]

---

1. For the dates cf. E. Dzagatspanian, "Ακόμη μια φορά για την τουρκική άλωση της Θεσσαλονίκης στα τέλη του 14ου αιώνα" *ByzMak* 87–9.
2. ... κατατρέχουσι μὲν οὐκ ἐν πολλῷ χρόνῳ Θρᾴκην ἅπασαν καὶ Μακεδονίαν, καταστρέφονται δὲ Μυσοὺς τούς τε ἐν τῇ μεσογείᾳ καὶ πρὸς τῷ Ἴστρῳ οἰκοῦντας, ἔτι δὲ Ἰλλυριούς, Τριβαλλούς, Ἕλληνας ἄλλα τε γένη πολλά ... τὰς μὲν ἐν τῇ μεσογείᾳ, τὰς δὲ ἐν τῇ παραλίᾳ κειμένας (Michael Kritoboulos 1.14.6).
3. Κωστής Παλαμάς, *Η Φλογέρα του Βασιλιά*, Δ 146–60. *Νεοελληνική Βιβλιοθήκη* (Athens 1989) 83f. The English translation is taken from Kostes Palamas, *The King's Flute*, transl. Th.Ph. Stephanides & G.C. Katsimbalis, preface Ch. Diehl, introd. E.P. Papanoutsos, ed. D.P. Synadinos (Athens 1982) 135–7:

   But whether Greek or Roman — even Turk,
   One faith holds them, one tongue, and one ideal;
   They form one nation. Flood, drouth, pruning, tilth,
   Have tried the tree, but they have never changed it. —
   Soldiers there are from Adrianople town,
   Dyrrachium, Arta, and Nicopolis;

Lords from Euripus; princes from the Isles.
And sons of Thessaloniki; bold men,
War-leaders from that shore that ever stands,
A priestess and a queen, with a drawn sword
In one strong hand, the Gospels in the other;
And who by her exploits on land and sea
Has been a glory to the Grecian race.
Both Macedonia's rivers and her men
Unite as one to fight ... and to restrain and hold ...

Ioannis Tarnanidis

The Macedonians of the Byzantine period

In their efforts to restore in the memory and consciousness of the people those ethnic links which History and Tradition had guarded and preserved throughout the passage of time, it was very understandable that scholars should turn to the past and seek out the roots of Neohellenism. The Byzantine period represents a crucial stage in this quest, because Byzantium was born a multinational state, and it was this that permitted its various component populations to communicate and intermingle — which, in turn, put their ethnic purity under continuous pressure.[1] Nevertheless, the Byzantine period was a reality which, because of its duration and dynamism, left an indelible stamp on all the populations that composed the Empire or fell within range of its activities. This means that any investigation into the relationship between antiquity and the present must necessarily include an appreciation and evaluation of the influences that these populations were subject to, and the transformations that they underwent, as a result of the Empire's cultural influence as well as its trans-national conduct towards them.

When talking about the Macedonians, therefore, we must not lose sight of the fact that their modern representatives go back to the Byzantines rather than being descended directly from the ancients. Any direct recourse to antiquity ignores, wittingly or unwittingly, more than a thousand years of development and tradition and, naturally, is incapable of fully explaining the present. Contemporary reality is informed by a tradition and historical consciousness that goes back to Byzantium and was kept alive during the years of Turkish occupation. It is thus in the Macedonians of the Byzantine period, and of Byzantine writers, that we must seek the direct forebears and the most reliable exponents of this particular facet of the broader Hellenic world.

When talking about Byzantium, the eastern section of the Roman Empire, it is important to recall that the Greek element, the Greek language and Greek thought had gradually came to prevail and gain preeminence throughout the whole area,

---

1. The particularly strong presence of the Slav element within and around the boundaries of Byzantine society, and its relations with Hellenism, has been the subject of much discussion. Even in the past the topic always held a certain contemporary relevance, and recently, with the dissolution of Socialist Yugoslavia and the upsurge of nationalism in the countries that used to belong to it, the matter has again engaged the attention of specialist historians and researchers. Although the current discussion lacks the intensity provoked by the views of Fallmerayer in the last century, the views of scholars on the issue continue to diverge, permitting different interpretations of the current situation as well. On this see the recent well-documented study by Professor V. Papoulia, of the Aristotelian University: "Τὸ πρόβλημα τῆς εἰρηνικῆς διεισδύσεως τῶν Σλάβων στὴν Ἑλλάδα" *ByzMak* 255–65, with earlier and more recent bibliography. Cf. I. Tarnanides, "Το Άγιο Όρος ανάμεσα στο Βυζάντιο και στους Σλάβους" *Το Άγιον Όρος, χθες–σήμερα–αύριο* (Thessaloniki 1996).

Byzantine Macedonia. Identity Image and History. Edited by John Burke & Roger Scott (*Byzantina Australiensia* 13, Melbourne 2000).

making a decisive contribution to the whittling down of differences between its peoples. This preceding linguistic and cultural domination of the region by Hellenism prepared the ground for the penetration and spread of the new religion, Christianity, which then grafted so vigorously onto the stock it found in its path that it became a second creative force throughout the entire life of the Eastern Roman Empire, shaping its existence, driving its cultural development and enhancing its reputation for over a thousand years.

As we all know, it was from this intimate embrace of Greek thought and Christian teaching that Orthodoxy emerged. It emerged as a particular religious faith and understanding, but it was primarily as a tradition arising out of a specific intellectual context, with its corresponding cultural extensions, that Orthodoxy would seem to have exerted an even more catalytic influence in bringing all of the Empire's subjects closer together and homogenising the various population groups that constituted its most permanent inhabitants. But this was not only an evolutionary development of Byzantine society, generated naturally by the forces inherent in its constituent elements; it was also the product of a conscious political choice by its governments, who saw in the dominant Greek element and the Christian unity of its subjects the vital principles needed for a soundly-organised ecumenical empire.

As things developed, therefore, the fate of the individual ethnic groups that together made up Byzantine society was dubious and uncertain. Our sources do not provide the data and information on the basis of which we might, in accordance with the ethnocentric view of history that prevails today, be able to follow the distinctive presence and development of these groups. Byzantine authors lived in the natural atmosphere of their world, as we have described it above, with its Christian spirituality and conduct expressed in Greek thought and the Greek language; they did not place much weight on the individual ethnic groups that had come together long ago and formed Byzantine society on an enduring basis, and it was only natural that they did not expend their time and their literary efforts in describing them in detail. These authors' occasional and incidental references to the particular ethnicity of certain eminent persons or groups or Byzantine military corps occur within the ecumenical spirit of the Byzantine state, and it is because of this that they did not leave us relatively more information.

This applies even more forcefully with respect to the various eponymous Greek tribes, which began to lose their particular identity from as early as the time of the Roman occupation and to be seen more or less as a single grouping. The Greeks are referred to in general as 'Romans', as a 'Roman' or 'Christian' nation.[1] When Byzantine authors make a distinction among them, it is on the basis of their

1. See D.A. Zakythinos, *Buzantin} ^Ystoría* (Athens 1972) 13–14, 17–18. Cf. *Ta yaúmata tou Ag. Dhmhtríou* PG 116 col. 1364A: kaí kayáper \n t_ Aśgúpt~ \pí toû FaraQ h[jáneto tó tôn ^Ebraívn génow, oɔtv kaí \n toútoiw katá tón ъmoion trópon, diá têw ěryodójou pístevw kaí toû đgíou kaí zvopoioû baptísmatow, hŹjeto tó tôn Xristianôn fûlon; col. 1365A: lambánei tón pánta Rvmaívn laón; col. 1365C: oý \k tôn Rvmaívn; col. 1368C: \k toû Rvmaívn fúlou; col. 1369B: oý loipoí tôn Xristianôn.

specific place of origin, and that in a purely external and geographic sense. There are thus frequent references to Achaians, Thessalians, Macedonians, Cappadocians etc., but these are always particular segments of the Byzantine populace or of some Byzantine military force. In any event, even in these references it can be seen that, over time, the residents and citizens of Byzantium shed the consciousness of their particular ethnic origins — even more so the various Greek tribes — and aligned themselves towards the common intellectual and religious tradition of their great and pre-eminent state. In relation to other peoples, their defining characteristic was not their ancestry and their ethnic origins but their religion, their language, their culture, and their overall intellectual and spiritual identity.

The fate of the Macedonians, as a separate Greek tribe, followed the same evolutionary path. From as early as Roman times their distinctiveness vis-a-vis the rest of the Greeks is quite indiscernible. As this particular period is not the object of our present inquiry, however, we will here merely allude to the approach suggested by the visit of St. Paul to the region and his subsequent correspondence with the inhabitants of the two most important cities of Macedonia, Philippi and Thessaloniki. Nowhere is there any mention of 'Macedonians', and the recipients of the letters seem no different from the Corinthians or Ephesians in language or mentality. This, of course, in no way proves the non-existence of the Macedonians, since a description of the various ethnic groups he encountered on his journey was something St. Paul neither intended nor provided. But it is clearly indicative of the cultural homogeneity and the identity in language and consciousness of the populations that the Apostle encountered. But what did happen to the Macedonians? Did they completely vanish?

Throughout the whole of the so-called Middle Ages, Byzantine writers do not cease making reference to Macedonia, Macedonian Forces, and Macedonians. But the meaning of each term is unclear, and its use is not always synonymous. Thus, at various times the term 'Macedonia' covers more than one administrative district of the Roman, the Byzantine and later the Ottoman Empire, and none of them is ever permanent and stable.[1] At this point it is enough to recall the remark of the great Roman historian Livy who, between the first century BC and the first century AD, says characteristically: "Even the Macedonians themselves did not know how big Macedonia was."[2]

What interests us here, however, is to search for the Macedonians through the references made to them by Byzantine historical writers. But let us state in advance that this is a very large topic, both as a field of inquiry and as the object of a separate analysis of the sources, and it has not yet been sufficiently studied. Within the framework of a broader program called "Macedonia and the Slav world", and with

---

1. For the ancient and Roman periods see G.I. Theocharides, *^Istoría têw Makedoníaw katá toúw mésouw xrónouw (285–1354)* (Thessaloniki 1980) 17–34; for the Byzantine period, G. Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State* tr. J. Hussey (2nd ed., Oxford 1968) 236, 332–3.
2. Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita* 45.30: "Quanta Macedonia esset ... Macedones quoque ignorabant."

the assistance of our postgraduate students and other scholars, since 1990 we have been excerpting, discussing and building a database of the terms 'Μακεδών' (a Macedonian) and the adjective 'Μακεδονικός' as we find them in Byzantine authors.[1] In this paper we take a general approach to the topic, referring selectively to a number of representative passages from among those we have excerpted to date. These passages allow us to draw fairly safe conclusions about certain constants that govern the aforementioned terms.

The passages to which we will refer come from more than ten eminent Byzantine writers and cover a period of eight centuries, from the seventh to the fourteenth. By way of clarification, we ought to state that we do not regard as any less significant those instances where it is known that the authors used their predecessors as sources or even copied them. In these cases too, what is important is the fact that the term 'Macedonians' continued in use as the years and the centuries passed, for the obvious reason that each new use of the term represents a re-affirmation of its meaning. As we get down to the main part of this paper and approach our sources, we should also explain that we have sorted citations of the terms in question into three separate groups because we found that each group is susceptible of a different interpretation or interpretations. The three groups are:

1. Macedonians, otherwise unspecified,
2. Macedonian forces, which may appear as 'phalanxes', 'unit', 'armies', 'companies' etc., and
3. The Macedonians as a 'race'.

Group 1: Macedonians

We refer here, selectively and in chronological order, to Byzantine authors who make mention of Macedonians. Selectivity is unavoidable because the related research program is still incomplete, while chronological order will let us detect any relationship between earlier writers and those that follow. In broad lines, the overall picture is as follows:

Commencing with the sixth and seventh centuries — the time of the Avaro-Slav descent into the Balkans — it is worth pausing a little with John the Metropolitan of Thessaloniki and the *Miracles of St. Demetrios*,[2] which he describes in his encomium on the Protector of the city. Here we find that, in the consciousness of the Metropolitan, the inhabitants of Thessaloniki and defenders of

---

1. In the Slav sources, Macedonia and the Macedonians are mentioned only when the need arises in translating a Byzantine (Greek) text that refers to them. Macedonia is translated as 'Makedonija', and the Macedonians as 'Makedonci'. A special study will be made of the more recent period in which, from the eighteenth century on, the term 'Makedonci' becomes detached from the corresponding word in the Greek lexicon and follows its own path of semantic develpment within the Slav lexicon.
2. The text has been published, with commentary and translation, in many languages. It has recently been published, with introduction, commentary, text and parallel Modern Greek translation, by P. Christou, *Η γραμματεία των Δημητρείων. Α΄ Διηγήσεις περί των Θαυμάτων του Αγίου Δημητρίου* (Thessaloniki 1993), based on Lemerle, *Miracles* I: *Le Texte*.

the city against the Avaro-Slav incursions are the Macedonians. This emerges clearly in each of his two references to them. The first occurs when, during the state of general panic which the siege of Thessaloniki creates, he imagines the city's enemies to be ἰσόψαμμον ἐν ἀριθμῷ 'as numerous as the grains of sand in the sea' and regards the defenders as comparatively few:

> And secondly, because the besiegers were as numerous as the grains of sand in the sea. For if one were to imagine not only all the Macedonians but also the Thessalians and Achaians massed together at that time in Thessaloniki, it would be only a small fraction of those who surrounded the city.[1]

The second reference occurs when, after the siege has been lifted, he attributes to St. Demetrios the fact that the inhabitants found the courage to defend the city: "He who put courage into the Macedonians."[2]

One might wonder, however, why his references to the Macedonians are so sparse in a text as extensive and full of episodes as the one we are discussing. It is obvious that by this time the title 'Macedonians' no longer denoted a specific tribe differentiated from others by its own distinctive characteristics, and so historical writers felt no need or obligation to mention them separately. The Macedonians are the same as the rest of the Empire's citizens, with the simple addition that they are inhabitants of Macedonia. This is also evident — indirectly, of course — in the author's first reference to Macedonians, where the term is used side by side with another two terms of the same type: the Thessalians and the Achaians. The Thessalians and the Achaians can certainly be none other than the inhabitants of Thessaly and Achaia, a fact which means that the sense of these two terms was not 'tribal' but purely geographic. The inhabitants of Thessaly were the Thessalians, and the inhabitants of Achaia were the Achaians. Consequently, the term 'Macedonians', which is the same kind of word as the other two used in the phrase, must also have had the sense of denoting a geographical homeland. It is not so easy to interpret the author's second reference to Macedonians. The reference here is to the inhabitants of Thessaloniki, whom Metropolitan John chooses to characterise as Macedonians. In characterising them thus, what is certain is that he did not want to distinguish them from Byzantines outside the walls. He probably wanted to raise their morale by reminding them who their ancestors were long ago. Moreover, we should not forget the fact that this text is a transcript of a panegyric that was delivered orally.

---

1. Δεύτερον δέ [διά] τό ἰσόψαμμον ἐν ἀριθμῷ τῶν πολιορκούντων· εἰ γάρ μή μόνον τούς Μακεδόνας ἅπαντας, ἀλλά καί Θετταλούς καί Ἀχαιούς ὑποθεῖτό τις σωρηδόν ἐν Θεσσαλονίκῃ τηνικαῦτα συνηθροισμένους, οὐδέ τό πολλοστόν μέρος τῶν ἔξωθεν περιστοιχισάντων τήν πόλιν ἐτύγχανον (PG 116 col. 1292C; cf. Christou, op.cit. 318).
2. ... ὁ τό θάρσος τοῖς Μακεδόσιν ἐνθείς (PG 116 col. 1308B; cf. Christou, op.cit. 340).

The ninth-century writer George Monachos, also called the Sinner,[1] must have used the terms in the same sense:

> In the days of the Emperor Theophilos there was in Macedonia a commander named Kordyles. He had a very brave son named Bardas, whom he left in his stead in charge of the Macedonians who were across the river Danube ...[2]
>
> In desperation, the Macedonians made Tzantzes and Kordyles their leaders[3]
>
> And being unable to cross Bulgaria, they joined up with the Hungarians and told them all about the Macedonians[4]
>
> When the Turks saw this, they attacked ... and when they were turned back, the Macedonians pursued them[5]

It is clear that here too the term 'Macedonians' has to do with Macedonia as a military administrative province, with armies and with military operations.

Persisting in his use of the term, however, George Monachos later appears to go beyond the simple dependence of the name of the inhabitants on the name of the region and gives the impression of having in mind a specific people called 'Macedonians'. This can be inferred from the following passages:

> A young Macedonian named Leo, of the Gomostes family, rose up[6]
>
> ... and other famous Macedonians[7]
>
> And a Macedonian fraudster, Basil, who gave out that he was Constantine Doukas... [8]

---

1. Cf. I.E. Karagiannopoulos, *Πηγαί τῆς Βυζαντινῆς Ἱστορίας* (Thessaloniki 1971) 202–3 no. 210.
2. Ἐν δέ ταῖς ἡμέραις Θεοφίλου τοῦ βασιλέως ἦν στρατηλάτης ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ Κορδύλης προσαγορευόμενος. Εἶχε δέ καί υἱόν Βάρδαν ὀνόματι, ἠνδρειωμένον πάνυ, ὅν κατέλιπεν ἀντ' αὐτοῦ ἄρχειν τῶν Μακεδόνων τῶν ὄντων πέραν τοῦ ποταμοῦ Δανουβίου (PG 109 col. 880A).
3. Ἀπογνόντες οὖν οἱ Μακεδόνες ἐποίησαν κεφαλήν αὐτῶν τόν τε Τζάντζην καί τόν Κορδύλην (PG 109 col. 880B).
4. Οἱ δέ μή δυνηθέντες περᾶσαι Βουλγαρίαν προσερρύησαν τοῖς Οὔγγροις καί ἀνήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς πάντα τά τῶν Μακεδόνων (PG 109 col. 880B).
5. Θεασάμενοι δέ τοῦτο οἱ Τοῦρκοι συνέβαλον πόλεμον ... καί τραπέν τό ἔθνος, κατεδίωκον αὐτούς οἱ Μακεδόνες (PG 109 col. 880C).
6. Ἀναστάς δέ Μακεδόνων νεώτερος, Λέων ὀνόματι, ἐκ γένους τῶν Γωμοστῶν (PG 109 col. 880D).
7. ... καί ἕτεροι ὀνομαστοί τῶν Μακεδόνων (ibid.).
8. Βασίλειος δέ τις Μακεδών πλάνος, Κωνσταντῖνον Δοῦκα ἑαυτόν εἶναι ἐπιφημίσας ... (PG 109 973D).

> ... Basil the Macedonian was emperor[1]

In these references to Macedonians the author repeatedly uses the term to identify certain individuals, obviously, but perhaps also with a tendency to emphasise their particular origin. In the first reference, at least, the geographical sense of the term is of secondary importance, since Leo's Macedonian ancestry relates to a specific family, which was obviously known to be of Macedonian origin.

In contrast to George Monachos, the slightly later Byzantine historian John Kameniates, who came from Thessaloniki itself,[2] is very sparing. On the sole occasion that he refers to Macedonians, he leaves little room for extensions of meaning or other interpretations: "The home we come from, friends, is Thessaloniki ... a great city and first among the Macedonians."[3] It would seem very possible to interpret this apostrophe as a reference to the ancient Macedonian origin of the city.

The Continuer of Theophanes the Confessor, a writer of the tenth century,[4] uses the term under discussion in approximately the same way. His references to it are as follows:

> But he ... the Emperor Basil came from the land of the Macedonians...[5]

> Leo, the then strategos of the Thracians and Macedonians, whom they called Apostyppes[6]

> It happened that Apostyppes, with the Thracians and the Macedonians, was fighting on the right side[7]

> Stephanos, a Cappadocian, was sent, with Thracians and Macedonians and select Charsianites and Cappadocians, as strategos of the forces in Lombardy[8]

In the case of this author too, the terms 'Thracians', 'Charsianites' and 'Cappadocians', which are undoubtedly geographic and indicate military units coming from these regions, oblige us to interpret 'Macedonians' as a similar kind

---

1. ... ἐβασίλευσε Βασίλειος ὁ Μακεδών (PG 109 col. 900C).
2. See Karagiannopoulos, op.cit. 225 no. 258.
3. Ἡμεῖς, ὦ φῖλοι, πατρίδος ἐσμέν Θεσσαλονίκης, ... πόλεως μεγάλης καί πρώτης τῶν Μακεδόνων (Kameniates 490).
4. Karagiannopoulos, op.cit. 249–50 no. 307.
5. Πλήν οὖν οὗτος ... αὐτοκράτωρ Βασίλειος ὡρμᾶτο μέν ἐκ τῆς Μακεδόνων γῆς ... (PG 109 col. 228B).
6. Λέων ὁ τῶν Θρακῶν καί Μακεδόνων τότε στρατηγός, ὀν Ἀποστύππην ἐκάλουν (PG 109 col. 321A).
7. συνέβη τόν μέν Ἀποστύππην μετά τῶν Θρακῶν τε καί Μακεδόνων κατά τό δεξιόν μέρος ἀγωνιζόμενον (PG 109 col. 321B).
8. ... ἀποστέλλεται Στέφανος ... ὅς ἐκ Καππαδοκῶν, στρατηγός τῶν ἐν Λαγοβαρδίᾳ δυνάμεων μετά Θρακῶν καί Μακαδόνων καί ἐπίλεκτων Χαρσιανιτῶν και Καππαδοκῶν (PG 109 col. 328C).

of term, used in its geographical sense, that is, the troops coming from the administrative region of Macedonia.

Among the references found in Constantine Porphyrogennetos (905–959),[1] the information he gives us when describing the theme of Strymon is of particular significance. The relevant paragraph is as follows:

> The theme of Strymon is adjacent to Macedonia; it is nowhere referred to as a theme but ranked as a pass. It is controlled by Scyths rather than Macedonians, Justinian the Noseless having settled them in the mountains of Strymon and on the trails in the passes.[2]

The information we can draw from this passage is very important because (a) he identifies the Scyths very firmly and does not call them Macedonians despite their being settled for centuries in a part of Macedonia and controlling it, and (b) he seems to have in mind the notion that there are some Macedonians whose identity as Macedonians is independent of where they live. That is to say, he implies that what bothers him is not that the theme of Strymon is not called Macedonia but that its inhabitants are not the Macedonians. Which means that it would be possible for the theme not to be Macedonia but its inhabitants Macedonians. Consequently, we can see that, in Porphyrogennetos' mind, the Macedonians were clearly a 'race' with a past and not merely named from time to time after the geographical area which they inhabited and which bore the name 'Macedonia'.

Leo the Deacon (tenth century)[3] also makes only a single reference to Macedonians. It occurs when, in talking about the detention of Kouropalates, the father of Bardas, on the island of Lesbos, he presents him as attempting to make an escape by bribing the Macedonians. The passage is as follows:

> Kouropalates, the father of Bardas, was under guard on the island of Lesbos but through Stephanos, the Bishop of Abydos, promised the Macedonians money and honours...[4]

In this context, the term 'Macedonians' might mean certain officers of the theme of Macedonia.

The references of John Skylitzes (eleventh century)[5] to Macedonia, Macedonian forces and Macedonians are also very enlightening. We will cite a very characteristic example which presents a quite clear reflection of the Macedonian presence in the lives and consciousness of eleventh-century Byzantines. In his chapter on the empress Theodora, and specifically at the point where he refers to the policy of her

---

1. See Karagiannopoulos, op.cit 241–3 no. 297.
2. Τό δέ θέμα τοῦ Στρυμόνος τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ συντέτακται καί οὐδαμοῦ τούτου λόγος ἐστί περί θέματος, ἀλλ' εἰς κλεισούρας τάξιν λελόγισται· καί Σκύθαι αὐτό ἀντί Μακεδόνων διανέμονται, Ἰουστινιανού τού Ρινοτμήτου ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι τοῦ Στρυμόνος καί ταῖς διαβάθραις τῶν κλεισουρῶν τούτους ἐγκατοικήσαντος (*De Them.* 88).
3. See Karagiannopoulos, op.cit. 253–4 no. 315.
4. Κουροπαλάτης, ὁ τοῦ Βάρδα τοκεύς, ἐς μέν τήν νῆσον Λέσβον φρουρούμενος διά Στεφάνου δέ, τού ἐπισκόπου Ἀβύδου, τοῖς Μακεδόσι χρήματα καί τιμάς ὑπισχνούμενος (Leo Diac. 7.1, p. 114 1–3).
5. See Karagiannopoulos, op.cit. 272–3 no. 354.

predecessor Constantine Monomachos, Skylitzes gives the following interesting information which reveals his concept of the Macedonians:

> Monomachos had happened to move all the Macedonian forces to the East, and all their leaders were Macedonians, one of whom was Bryennios. For there was a rumour among the Turks that the Turkish nation was fated to be destroyed by the sort of army that Alexander the Macedonian had when he destroyed the Persians.[1]

It is clear that here Skylitzes is not referring in only a general sense to inhabitants of Macedonia or military forces who came from the theme of Macedonia. He refers to Bryennios in particular, of whose Macedonian descent there was clear awareness, and to other Macedonian leaders like him; more importantly, the parallel drawn between these Macedonian forces and those of Alexander the Great leaves no room for any interpretation other than that the author and contemporary Byzantine society vividly remembered the Macedonian ancestry of their compatriots.

The references by Michael Attaleiates (eleventh century)[2] to Macedonians, which are not so infrequent, belong to the sphere of military movements and operations and, in terms of their conceptual content, may be classified under the heading of 'military forces'. The relevant passages are as follows:

> The infantry and the marine corps assembled in the same place ... and were there deceived into thinking that some Macedonians camped a great distance away were spying on them and intended to capture them[3]

> Some Macedonians in the fortress fell at the hands of the Rus ...[4]

> Reckoning that the revolt of the Macedonians was a lucky break for them, a not inconsiderable number of Patzinaks approached Adrianople, surrounded it, and threatened to strike against the emperor who had been acclaimed by the Macedonians[5]

---

1. ... ἔτυχε γάρ ὁ Μονομάχος διαπεραιωσάμενος πάσας ἐν ἑῴᾳ τάς Μακεδονικάς δυνάμεις, ἀρχηγούς ἐχούσας ἅπαντας Μακεδόνας, ὧν εἷς ἦν καί ὁ Βρυέννιος· ἐφέρετο γάρ ἐν Τούρκοις λόγος, ὡς εἴη πεπρωμένον καταστραφῆναι τό Τούρκων γένος ὑπό τοιαύτης δυνάμεως, ὁποίαν ὁ Μακεδῶν Ἀλέξανδρος ἔχων κατεστρέψατο Πέρσας (Skyl. 179).
2. See Karagiannopoulos, op.cit. 277–8 no. 360.
3. ... συνήρχοντο μέν γάρ ἐν ταυτῷ τό τε πεζικόν καί ναυτικόν στράτευμα ... καί ἀποπλανηθέντες ἐκεῖθεν ἐπί κατασκοπῇ καί καταλήψει δῆθεν τινῶν Μακεδόνων αὐλιζομένων ἐν πορρωτάτω ... (Attal. 254).
4. ... ἔπεσον δέ τινες Μακεδόνες ἐν τῷ κάστρῳ παρά τῶν Ρῶς ... (ibid.).
5. ... οἱ Πατζινάκαι τήν τῶν Μακεδόνων ἀποστασίαν ἰδίαν εὐπραγίαν καί εὔνοιαν λογισάμενοι, μετά πλήθους οὐκ ἐλαχίστου τῇ Ἀδριανουπόλει ... προσήγγισαν, καί ταύτην περικαθίσαντες τόν παρά τῶν Μακεδόνων προχειρισθέντα βασιλέα πατάξειν ἠπείλουν (Attal. 261–2).

> For he had a very large group of Patzinaks as allies; and they withdrew to the rear, seizing and looting the Macedonians' tents[1]

History tells us nothing about a revolt of the Macedonians or an acclamation by them of an emperor. The episode clearly involves armies and forces from the theme of Macedonia (excluding, of course, the Scyths and the Patzinaks).

When Anna Komnene (1083–1148) uses the term 'Macedonians', she too refers to military movements and the activities of her husband Nikephoros Bryennios.[2] The relevant passages are:

> Of which the left flank was held by Tarchaneiotes Katakalon, with about three thousand armed Macedonians and Thracians[3]

> Bryennios himself commanded the centre of the phalanx, which was made up of Macedonians and Thracians[4]

> Another man, a Macedonian called Petros, with the surname Tornikios[5]

> Konstantinos Hopos commanded the Imperial Guard, Antiochos the Macedonians, Alexander Kabasilas the Thracians[6]

It is clear that Anna Komnene's Macedonians are the soldiers and officers of the Byzantine army who come from the theme of Macedonia.

In the case of Nikephoros Bryennios (1062–1137)[7] we have somewhat more frequent use of the term 'Macedonian' and at closer quarters. The relevant passages are as follows:

> John left his deeds as an unforgettable monument to Thracians and Macedonians, and also to Illyrians and Bulgarians, rulers and ruled[8]

---

1. ... εἶχε γάρ συμμαχοῦν Πατζινάκων πλῆθος πολύ· οἳ ὀπισθόρμητοι γεγονότες τάς σκηνάς τῶν Μακεδόνων ἐσκύλευσαν καί διήρπασαν (Attal. 290).
2. See Karagiannopoulos, op.cit. 295–6 no. 393; Zakythinos, op.cit. 466.
3. Θάτερον δέ τό εὐώνυμον κέρας ὁ Ταρχανειώτης εἶχε Κατακαλών, Μακεδόνας τε καί Θρᾶκας ἐξοπλισμένους εἰς τρισχίλιους (An.Komn. 1.5.2, Leib & Gautier I 20).
4. Αὐτός δ' ὁ Βρυέννιος τό μέσον κατεῖχε τῆς φάλαγγος ἐκ τε Μακεδόνων καί Θρακῶν συντεταγμένον (ibid.).
5. Καί τις δ' ἄλλος Μακεδών, Πέτρος τήν κλῆσιν, Τορνίκιος τήν ἐπωνυμίαν ... (An.Komn. 1.8.5, Leib & Gautier I 33).
6. Ἐχῆρχε μέν οὖν τοῦ τῶν ἐξκουβιτῶν τάγματος Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Ὦπος, τοῦ Μακεδόνων ὁ Ἀντίοχος, τῶν Θετταλῶν δέ Ἀλέξανδρος Καβάσιλας (An.Komn. 4.4.3, Leib & Gautier I 151).
7. See Karagiannopoulos, op.cit. 287–8 no. 379.
8. Ὁ δέ Ἰωάννης ... μνημεῖον ἄληστον τάς αὐτοῦ πράξεις κατέλειπε Θραξί τε καί Μακεδόσι, καί μέντοι καί Ἰλλυριοῖς καί Βουλγάροις ἄρχουσί τε καί ἀρχομένοις (PG 127 col. 41D–44A).

> For [Bryennios] had with him all the ranks of both Macedonians and Thracians[1]
>
> Who ordered the ranks to stop and, taking with him the leaders, the commander of the Macedonians and the strategoi of the Thracians ... [2]
>
> Bryennios himself led the centre of the phalanx, in which were drawn up all the elite of both the Thracians and Macedonians and the best of the Thessalian cavalry[3]
>
> And a certain Macedonian fellow, Petros his name, Tornikios the surname ... [4]
>
> Seeing which, Basil Kourtikes, a Macedonian from Bryennios's family ... [5]

As a general, Bryennios had first-hand knowledge of things, of the region and its people. It is easy to see that he speaks of the Macedonians in a general sense, grouping them along with the Illyrians, the Thracians and the Bulgarians in a set whose members belong to the same semantic category. And since the term 'Bulgarians' could not have had a geographical meaning, nor the term 'Illyrians', it follows that the term 'Macedonians', which belongs here to the same semantic group, must also have had something more than just a geographical dimension to it. This is reinforced by the reference to Kourtikes: not only does he describe him as a Macedonian, he further explains that he had Macedonian relatives, being a member of the Macedonian Bryennios's family.

Constantine Manasses (twelfth century)[6] also uses the term 'Macedonian' twice, saying in his *Synopsis*: "When Basil the Great Macedonian saw this,"[7] and "In the first city, the famous city of the Macedonians ... "[8] Of course, of particular significance here is the fact that the Emperor Basil is called a Macedonian when he was known to be of Armenian ancestry.

---

1. Μακεδόνων τε γάρ καί Θρακῶν τάς τάξεις ἁπάσας εἶχε [ὁ Βρυέννιος] μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ (PG 127 col. 153D).
2. Ὁ δέ [Βρυέννιος] κελεύσας τάς τάξεις στῆναι καί τούς λογάδας παραλαβών, τόν τε Μακεδόνων ἄρχοντα, καί Θρακῶν στρατηγούς ... (PG 127 col. 178A).
3. Τό δέ μέσον τῆς φάλαγγος αὐτός ἐκεῖνος ὁ Βρυέννιος ἦγεν, ἐν ᾧ τό τε ἀρχοντικόν ἐτάττετο ἅπαν καί Θρακῶν δε καί Μακεδόνων καί τῆς ἵππου τῶν Θεσσαλῶν ὅσον ἐπίλεκτον (PG 127 col. 184A).
4. καί τις ἀνήρ Μακεδών, Πέτρος τὄνομα, Τορνίκιος τό ἐπώνυμον (PG 127 col. 201A).
5. ὅ θεασάμενος Βασίλειος ὁ Κουρτίκης, ἀνήρ Μακεδών τῶν τοῦ Βρυεννίου οἰκείων ... (PG 127 col. 201D).
6. See Karagiannopoulos, op.cit. 305 no. 411.
7. Ὅπερ ἰδών Βασίλειος ὁ Μακεδών ὁ Μέγας (line 5172, PG 127 col. 414A).
8. Τῇ πρωτοπόλει τῇ λαμπρᾷ τῶν Μακεδόνων πόλει ... (line 5193, PG 127 col. 414B).

The interesting use of the term by Niketas Choniates is very informative. He lived in the region and completed his *History* in the early thirteenth century.[1] His references to the Macedonians are as follows:

> "The entire Roman empire would laugh very loudly at me [the emperor Alexios is speaking] ... if, having gained the throne dishonourably, ... I were to dismiss my own son and install the Macedonian in my home ..." (referring to Bryennios in this way because he came from Orestias, which is one of the strong and prosperous cities of the Macedonians)[2]
>
> So a certain Eustratios, from the Macedonian battalion, was chosen ...[3]
>
> Constantine took the words of the Macedonian as a personal insult ... [4]
>
> And bracing his sword-holding right hand ... he did not stop striking the Macedonian again and again[5]
>
> ... but saying that the Macedonian would clearly die[6]
>
> ... bringing down his arm, the Macedonian cut Constantine's shield in two[7]
>
> The Macedonian was asked by the emperor ...[8]
>
> So returning to their homes they incited a revolt among the cities of the Thracians and Macedonians[9]

As we see, in addition to his pointed reference to Eustratios as a Macedonian, he also justifies his characterisation of Bryennios as a Macedonian on the grounds that

---

1. See Karagiannopoulos, op.cit. 322–4 no. 441.
2. Ἐπ' ἐμοί δέ καί μάλα καπυρόν γελάσειε τό Πανρώμαιον ... εἰ τὴν βασιλείαν οὐκ ἐπαινετῶς εἰληφώς ... τόν μέν ἐξ ὀσφύος ἀποπεμψαίμην, τόν δέ Μακεδόνα εἰσοικισαίμην, τόν Βρυέννιον οὕτω λέγων, ἐπεί καί ἐξ Ὀρεστιάδος ὥρμητο· μία δ' αὕτη τῶν εὐδαιμόνων καί κρατίστων παρά Μακεδόσιν πόλεων (PG 139 col. 325A).
3. Ὡς οὖν Εὐστράτιός τις ἐκ τοῦ τῶν Μακεδόνων ἐπεκρίθη τάγματος (PG 139 col. 348A).
4. Ὕβριν τοίνυν οἰκείαν ὁ Κωνσταντῖνος τά τοῦ Μακεδόνος ἡγησάμενος ρήματα ... (ibid.).
5. Οὐκοῦν καί τήν δεξιάν ξιφηφοροῦσαν τονώσας ... πλήττων καὶ καταπλήττων οὐκ ἀνίει τόν Μακεδόνα (PG 139 col. 348B).
6. ἀλλά καί τό μή τεθνάναι τόν Μακεδόνα λαμπρῶς ἀπειπάμενος ... (ibid.).
7. ... τήν χεῖρα κατενεγκών ὁ Μακεδών διχῇ τόν Κωνσταντίνου θυρεόν διαιρεῖ ... (PG 139 col. 348C).
8. Ἐρωτηθείς δέ πρός τοῦ βασιλέως ὁ Μακεδών ... (ibid.).
9. Ἐπανηκότες οὖν ἐς τά σφέτερα τάς τῶν Θρακῶν καί Μακεδόνων πόλεις διαφιστῶσι (PG 139 col. 1000B).

he came from Orestias, which was one of the strongest and most flourishing Macedonian cities.

All the above references to Macedonians, spread as they are across the centuries, give the impression of an unbroken continuity. They cannot be, and they do not seem to be, accidental. Behind these general references there seems to be some vague memory of the specific Macedonian tribe that lived and achieved great things in the region. At the same time, however, the term 'Macedonians' seems to have broadened to embrace all the inhabitants of Macedonia.

Group 2: Macedonian forces

Equally unclear, but consistent with the new Byzantine reality — that is, with its military and administrative division into themes — is the use of the expressions and terms 'Macedonian forces', 'Macedonian phalanxes', 'Macedonian units', 'Macedonian armies', 'Macedonian formations, 'Macedonian ranks', 'Macedonian companies'. This means that, in order to understand and correctly interpret each term, it is necessary to take into account the historical circumstances that prevailed in Byzantium, as well as the political, military and other changes that occurred in administrative institutions during each specific period.

What is of particular importance for the present inquiry, and the question that we are called upon to explore, is whether the adjective 'Macedonian' is used only in the sense of its geographical dimension or perhaps also includes the element of a hereditary relationship with the 'race' of Macedonians.

As with the previous group, the Byzantines used this term continuously throughout the entire life-span of the Empire. With respect in particular to the lengthy period that concerns us, it is worth citing the use of the term by George Monachos, Leo the Deacon, Michael Attaleiates, Nikephoros Bryennios and Nikephoros Gregoras. The relevant passages are as follows:

(a) George Monachos:

> Basil was then twenty five years old. Having returned to his homeland, he entered the service of the strategos of Macedonia, called Tzantzes,...[1]
>
> And a message arrived from the strategos of Macedonia, that Symeon the leader of the Bulgarians intended to march against the Romans ...[2]

1. Ἦν δέ τότε Βασίλειος ὡς εἶναι τά ἔτη αὐτοῦ κε'. Ἀποκατασταθείς δέ ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ χώρᾳ προσεκολλήθη δουλεύειν στρατηγῷ Μακεδονίας τῷ λεγομένῳ Τζάντζῃ ... (PG 109 col. 880D).
2. Ἦλθε δέ καί ἀγγελία παρά τοῦ στρατηγοῦ Μακεδονίας ὡς ὁ ἄρχων Βουλγαρίας Συμεών βούλεται ἐκστρατεῦσαι κατά Ρωμαίων ... (PG 109 col. 913B).

(b) Leo the Deacon:

> After he formed an alliance with Marianos and Paschalios and the Tornikii, who were patricians and showed enthusiasm, and supplied them with a Macedonian phalanx, he held out strongly, blocking Nikephoros's access to Byzantium[1]
>
> Marianos and Paschalios led the unit of Macedonians around the roads and, threatening boastfully and tossing their heads, renewed their plotting[2]

(c) Michael Attaleiates:

> At the very beginning of Spring, while he [the emperor] was campaigning in Melitene, the Macedonian armies became agitated and fomented a major revolt[3]
>
> And he attacked Rhaidestos ... with his whole army, for it alone of the Macedonian cities had not submitted and fallen into line with him[4]
>
> And so when Bryennios (Nikephoros) reached Traianopolis he met up with his brother and the Franks and Macedonian companies collaborating with him[5]

(d) Nikephoros Bryennios:

> For he had with him all the ranks of both Macedonians and Thracians[6]

---

1. Τόν Μαριανόν δέ καί τόν Πασχάλιον καί τούς Τορνίκιους, ἐν Πατρικίοις τελοῦντες καί θερμουργούς πεφηνότες ἑταιρισάμενος, καί Μακεδονικήν αὐτοῖς ἐγχειρίσας φάλαγγα, ἀντείχετο κραταιῶς, ἀποτοιχίζων τῷ Νικηφόρῳ τήν εἰς τό Βυζάντιον πάροδον ... (Leo Diac. 3.7, p. 45 15–19).
2. ὁ δέ Μαριανός καί ὁ Πασχάλιος τήν τῶν Μακεδόνων σπείραν κατά τάς ἀγυιάς περιφέροντες, ἐμβρενθυόμενοι τε κενῷ κόμπῳ καί ἐξυπτιάζοντες, νεώτερα ραδιουργεῖν οὐκ ἐνέλιπον (Leo Diac. p. 46 7–10).
3. ἐν μιᾷ δέ ἔαρος ὥρᾳ τῇ Μελιτηνῇ στρατηγοῦντος αὐτοῦ τά Μακεδονικά συνεταράχθη στρατεύματα, μακράν ἀποστασίαν ὠδίνοντα ... (Attal. 22).
4. καί κατά Ῥαιδεστοῦ ... πανστρατιᾷ ἐξωρμήσατο μόνη γάρ αὕτη τῶν Μακεδονικῶν οὐ συναπήχθη τούτῳ καί συνεφρόνησε (Attal. 28).
5. Καταλαβών οὖν εἰς Τραϊανούπολιν ὁ Βρυέννιος (Νικηφόρος) συνηντήθη παρά τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ καί τῶν συναραμένων αὐτῷ Φράγγων καί Μακεδονικῶν παρατάξεων (Attal. 246).
6. Μακεδόνων τε γάρ καί Θρακῶν τάς τάξεις ἁπάσας εἶχε μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ (PG 127 col. 153D).

> Bryennios mustered together the whole of the Macedonian and Thracian army, brought up allies, and set forth towards Byzantium[1]
>
> This phalanx was made up of Macedonian and Thracian troops amounting to three thousand[2]

(e) Nikephoros Gregoras (1290–1360):[3]

> The Emperor Michael took the Thracian and Macedonian forces, and with them the phalanxes of Massagetes and Tourkopouloi[4]
>
> Outside the walls at the time, suspecting that there might be trouble, was the Despot Demetrios and the protovestiarios Andronikos and Michael Asan, with the allied army of the Triballoi, and they had brought up the Macedonian forces of the Romans[5]

It is clear that the preceding instances are all specific and refer to representatives of an established military institution. This means that, although the 'Macedonians' of Byzantine times were continuously identified and named as such across the centuries, regardless of the geographical name acquired from time to time by the region in which they lived, the 'Macedonian forces' were necessarily and substantively dependent on the geographical district that was called 'Macedonia' at that particular moment. That is, while the Byzantine inhabitants of Philippi, for example, or Serres, were always called Macedonians, in the tenth century these cities belonged to the theme not of Macedonia but of Strymon and the military body that represented the area was not officially titled 'Macedonian'. This distinction in meaning between the terms 'Macedonians' and 'Macedonian forces' is particularly evident in Nikephoros Gregoras, who repeatedly refers to 'Macedonia' and 'Macedonian armies' but makes no reference whatsoever to 'Macedonians' in the two instances cited above.

This might mean that, for Nikephoros Gregoras and the other Byzantine historians, not every member of the 'Macedonian forces' was necessarily a

---

1. Ὁ δέ Βρυέννιος τό Μακεδονικόν καί Θρακικόν στράτευμα συλλεξάμενος ὅλον, ἐπαγόμενος καί συμμάχους ἐξώρμα πρός τό Βυζάντιον (PG 127 col. 176C).
2. ἐπλήρουν δέ ταύτην τήν φάλαγγα αἱ τῶν Μακεδόνων τε καί Θρακῶν ἴλαι ἐς τρισχιλίους ποσούμεναι (PG 127 col. 181D).
3. See Karagiannopoulos, op.cit. 357–8 no. 503.
4. ἀναλαβών ὁ βασιλεύς Μιχαήλ τάς Θρακικάς τε καί Μακεδονικάς δυνάμεις, καί ξύν γε αὐταῖς τάς τε Μασσαγετῶν καί ὅσαι τῶν Τουρκοπούλων φάλαγγες ἦσαν ... (PG 148 col. 392A).
5. Ἔτυχον δέ τηνικαῦτα διατρίβοντες ἔξω τῶν τειχῶν διά τάς ὑποψίας τῶν θορυβῶν μετά τοῦ ἀπό τῶν Τριβαλλῶν συμμαχικοῦ στρατοῦ ὁ τε δεσπότης Δημήτριος καί ὁ πρωτοβεστιάριος Ἀνδρονικός καί ὁ Ἀσάν Μιχαήλ, ἐπαγόμενοι καί τά Μακεδονικά τῶν Ρωμαίων στρατεύματα (PG 148 col. 596D).

'Macedonian', and certainly not every resident of the theme of Macedonia (as defined at the time).

Group 3: The Macedonian 'race'

We have left until last this group, in which reference is made by name to a specific 'race', because we believe that it is the most important group and can provide a clearer answer to the question of what the current meaning of the term 'Macedonians' was during the Byzantine era. By extension, it may also help in exploring the essence of the problem, which is whether or not there existed a particular, clearly-identified group that was regarded as the descendants of the 'race' of Macedonians.

We can already say, before going any further, that the Byzantines did not forget the Macedonians. This was evident in the earlier groups, even though it was not easy to distinguish there whether those involved were real Macedonians or simply eponymous inhabitants of Macedonia.

It is a fact that there is a singular lack of specific reference in the Byzantine sources to a Macedonian 'race'. With respect to the characterisation of a person as a Macedonian, the case of the Emperor Basil I is interesting. As we saw above, the Continuer of Theophanes informs us that ὡρμᾶτο μέν ἐκ Μακεδόνων γῆς, τό δέ γένος εἴλκεν ἐξ 'Αρμενίων ἔθνους ('he came from the land of the Macedonians, but he was descended from the nation of the Armenians'), while George Monachos says that, in the year 867 after the divine incarnation, ἐβασίλευσε Βασίλειος ὁ Μακεδών ('Basil the Macedonian became emperor'). We also saw that John Skylitzes[1] too preserves the characterisation of Basil as a Macedonian, as does Manasses, who says ὅπερ ἰδών Βασίλειος ὁ Μακεδών ὁ Μέγας ('When Basil the Great Macedonian saw this'). The true dimensions of the Byzantine notion of a 'Macedonian' are revealed in the successive references made by these Byzantine writers. The Byzantine 'Macedonian' might well come from another 'nation', with whatever meaning this term might have had. As can be seen in the case of Basil I, the sole prerequisite for characterisation as a Macedonian must have been that one came from 'the land of the Macedonians'. And indeed, if we can judge from this particular case, the 'land of the Macedonians' need not necessarily be the historical Macedonia of antiquity, it can be the administrative district designated as Macedonia by the Byzantine administration of the day. It is worth recalling here that the Emperor Basil I came from the area of Adrianople in Thrace, an area which is not recorded as the administrative theme of Macedonia until after 802.[2] But the question remains: could everybody who came "from the land of the Macedonians" be called a Macedonian?

George Monachos mentions a specific Macedonian, and gives more information about him, as though he wanted to assure his readers of the man's

1. Skyl. 262, 277.
2. As George Monachos informs us: Ὁ αὐτός Βασίλειος γεννᾶται ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ ἐν τοῖς χωρίοις 'Αδριανουπόλεως (PG 109 col. 877D). On Thrace as the theme of Macedonia see Ostrogorski, *Istorija Vizantije* 198 and n. 2.

particular ancestry. He says, as we saw above, "A young Macedonian named Leo, of the Gomostes family, rose up." The Gomostes family must have been thoroughbred Macedonian and well-known in Byzantine society. Our author thus had a particular reason for making special mention of it. This is confirmed in the sequel, where he tells us his hero was promoted to high office and, as we saw, with other compatriots, among whom stood out καί ἕτεροι ὀνομαστοί τῶν Μακεδόνων ('and other famous Macedonians'), drove away the Turks (= Hungarians). Might all this mean that, in the understanding of the author's Byzantine contemporaries, only those who came 'from the race of the Macedonians' were considered to be Macedonians, and that George Monachos knew that his characterisation of the Armenian Basil as a Macedonian constituted an exception? We don't know. In any event, the particular incident he records, concerning the movement of a certain Macedonian population towards the Danube and, after many tribulations, its eventual return εἰς Μακεδονίαν, εἰς τήν ἰδίαν χώραν αὐτῶν ('to Macedonia, to their homeland'), argues in favour of the view that the author's reference to a 'race' of Macedonians is both conscious and deliberate. And what is for us most important: that he was aware that this 'race' still existed and that its homeland was Macedonia.

Another interesting reference to a Macedonian, in which there is again mention of the specific origin and family of the person involved, occurs in Nikephoros Bryennios. As we saw above, Bryennios writes: ὅ θεασάμενος Βασίλειος ὁ Κουρτίκης, ἀνήρ Μακεδών τῶν τοῦ Βρυεννίου οἰκείων ('Seeing which, Basil Kourtikes, a Macedonian from Bryennios's family'). But it is another Byzantine writer, Niketas Choniates, who tells us about Bryennios's Macedonian ancestry. Writing, as we saw, in the thirteenth century, Choniates makes particular reference to specific individuals whom he characterises as Macedonians. Thus, in addition to Bryennios, he mentions a certain Eustratios, who makes his appearance in a military episode. With respect to Bryennios in particular, he explains that he calls him a Macedonian 'because he came from Orestias'. And this means that Orestias, which was 'one of the strong and flourishing cites of the Macedonians', as he goes on to explain, retained a living sense of its Macedonian identity and that its inhabitants had not forgotten that there was something special about being descended from the 'race' of Macedonians.

There is, however, another reference to a Macedonian 'race' from the same part of the thirteenth century, and it is made by one who knew the region and its residents better than anyone else. The reference belongs to the well-known prelate and learned jurist, the incumbent of the Archiepiscopal See of Ochrid, Demetrios Chomatenos.[1] His law studies in Constantinople, his service in the church of Ochrid and his prolific writings all testify to his learning, his experience and his accurate evaluation of conditions in the province of which he was pastor for about forty years. Of particular importance for the present question is the fact that

1. For the basic bibliography on Demetrios Chomatianos see L. Stiernon, "Δημήτριος Χωματιανός ἡ Χωματηνός" *ThEE* IV 1065–6.

Chomatenos sketched and recorded a state of affairs that had developed and become well-established in the life of the inhabitants of thirteenth-century Macedonia.

But let us get down to specifics. A dispute about a vineyard was brought before the archbishop. The vineyard, it seems, belonged a certain Drazes, son of Gridos, who had purchased it in the normal way. His opponent, Ioannes Ierakares, tried to represent the vineyard as part of a deceased estate and, as he was the nearest relative, to claim it as the heir.

What is of interest in the situation is that, while both parties come from the same district, they clearly belong to different ethnic groups. Ioannes Ierakares, whose claim to the vineyard seems to be both insolent and false, is the son-in-law of a certain Bratonos, the son of Rados. On the other side are the legitimate claimants to the vineyard, starting with Stanna, the wife of Belkanos and cousin of Bratonos, and ending with the aforementioned Drazes, son of Gridos; and with them are the elderly witnesses to the lawful sale, Droboslavos, Dragomados and Dobros.

From the above it is clear that, at some point, the Greek Ioannes Ierakares had married into a Slav family. There is no room for doubt on this point, because of the evidence of the totally Slav names on the other side. He subsequently tried to appropriate one of their properties. Mentioned among the witnesses for the legitimate claimants, who as we said are Slavs, are certain notables of the district who, although they are on the same side as Ierakares from an ethnic point of view, do not hesitate to support Drazes.

But what amounts to a true revelation, however, concerning the relationship between the inhabitants of different ethnic background in the region of Ochrid (i.e. northern Macedonia) in the thirteenth century, is the clear distinction that Chomatenos allows to appear between the Greek (Macedonian) Ierakares and his Slav opponents. When presenting the opposing parties, with the obvious purpose of explaining why they could not find a solution to their problem by peaceful means, he tells us that Ierakares was of Macedonian ancestry, implying that his opponents were of something else.

The relevant passage is as follows:

> Recently another person showed himself to be like this [a scorpion's sting]: Ioannes, whose surname is Ierakares but he is the son-in-law of Bratonos, the son of Rados, from the village of Blastou, and is descended from the race of the Macedonians.[1]

Thus, in the second or third decade of the thirteenth century, the archbishop of Ochrid can identify and distinguish the Macedonians among his flock. This distinction is particularly significant because the term 'race of the Macedonians' is clearly used in contradistinction to the other side's 'race of non-Macedonians', which we know for certain to have been the 'Slavic race'. At this point we would add that it would have been very difficult, even for one as learned and as well-

1. Τοιοῦτος τις πέφηνεν ἄρτι καί Ἰωάννης ὁ ἐπιλεγόμενος μὲν Ἱερακάρης, γαμβρὸς δὲ τοῦ Βλαστηνοῦ Βρατωνοῦ τοῦ Ῥάδου, τὸ δὲ γένος ἕλκων ἐκ Μακεδόνων Chom. (Pitra. *Analecta* VI 315).

informed of local affairs as Demetrios Chomatenos, to make a distinction of this kind if all the people involved in the dispute that was brought before him had been exclusively Greeks from the local area. And this is because, as we saw in the references made to them in the Byzantine historians discussed above, all the Greeks of the area were Macedonians and were called Macedonians. To characterise specific individuals or families from among the Greeks of Macedonia as being descended from 'the race of the Macedonians' would require an investigation of a type and magnitude that not even the modern science of anthropology would be able to undertake it with any confidence. And nowhere else in his work has Chomatenos left any sign of off-handedness. The most probable explanation is that, in using the phrase 'from the race of the Macedonians', he follows the tradition of his era and means the native-born Greeks of Macedonia.

In conclusion, from the Byzantine references we have looked at, and from our analysis of the use of the terms Μακεδών ('a Macedonian') and Μακεδονικός ('Macedonian'), we have arrived with certainty at the following appraisal:

(a) The two terms do not always have the same meaning. They coincide only to the extent that they are used in their geographical sense.

(b) The adjective Μακεδονικός is used solely to describe forces and armies from the theme of Macedonia, that is, the government administrative and military region which at any given time bore this name. Because the geographical boundaries of the theme of Macedonia were not fixed and permanent, it was possible for a military unit coming from the same district to be described as Macedonian at some point in time and as something else at another. This could mean consequently that, although in command of the same units, the commanders of these armies might sometimes be referred to as generals of the Macedonians or Macedonia and sometimes not. And this is because of the fact that the meaning of the term was purely geographical and dependent on the administrative region, the theme, which bore the name at that particular time.

(c) To a large extent the term Μακεδών is also used in the geographical sense as well, in which case it denotes an inhabitant of Byzantine Macedonia. But because it is supported at the same time by other, non-geographical concepts (race, family etc.), it does not seem to be dragged blindly along after each and every administrative change made by the central authorities.

It is characteristic that those referred to from time to time as Macedonians are all members of Byzantine society or the Byzantine army. They speak the same language, and they do not seem to belong to a different religion or to turn against the Byzantine state when they are leaders of some group or other.

(d) It is in this sense that someone not of Macedonian ancestry could be called a Macedonian. A unique but very characteristic example is the case of the Emperor Basil I, of whom it is clearly stated that he was descended 'from the nation of the Armenians'. This did not prevent the Byzantines from calling him a Macedonian.

(e) It would seem that more recent settlers in Macedonia were, understandably, not included in this category, for the obvious reason that they retained their own ethnic identity (language, religion, culture etc.) and, most importantly, their

independence from Byzantine authority. Thus, for example, we have been unable to find a single instance of any Bulgarians, Slavs or Turks being characterised as Macedonians, even though, as we know, at a certain date they began to settle in the region and, from that time on, were among its more permanent inhabitants.

An interesting case of non-characterisation as a Macedonian — apart from the local Slav leaders who arose from time to time — is that of Czar Samuel. Although he came from the area of Ochrid and gained sway over Macedonia at the end of the tenth century and the start of the eleventh,[1] he is not characterised as a Macedonian in either the Byzantine or even the local Slavo-bulgarian sources. This would turn out to be especially interesting and indicative if his Armenian ancestry were eventually to be proved[2] and his case thus shown to be identical with that of Basil I, who was also an Armenian. And, naturally, it would be much more clearly understood that one of them was very naturally characterised as a Macedonian because he had accepted the status of a Byzantine citizen and Byzantine subject without reacting with recalcitrance, while the other was not accorded this honour by Byzantine writers and Byzantine society because his notoriety was based on his reaction against Byzantine authority. Of course, the fact that the city of Ochrid was not included at the time in the theme of Macedonia cannot have been the cause of his rejection, for two reasons: firstly, the city of Ochrid had been part of Macedonia in the past, and the greatest part of Samuel's state lay within the area of Macedonia; and secondly, as we have already noted, the characterisation of a person as a Macedonian does not seem to have faithfully followed the changes made by Byzantine authorities in the official and practical administrative division of the broader area of the Balkans. When, for example, the Emperor Alexios calls Bryennios a Macedonian because, according to Choniates, he came from Orestias, the 'prosperous' and ' extremely strong' city of the Macedonians, it is difficult to imagine that some temporary administrative change could make all of this cease to be true — that is, to make Orestias cease being a city of the Macedonians and its inhabitants cease being Macedonians. And it would be much less possible for the son of a well-known Macedonian family, such as the Gomostes to whom George Monachos refers — without, of course, telling us precisely where it was from — to cease being a Macedonian because a potential administrative relocation of the theme of Macedonia might leave him outside its boundaries.

From the extant sources one can indeed conclude with certainty that the prerogative of characterising a region as Macedonia and certain of its subjects as Macedonians always belonged to the Byzantine side. Because of this, in no foreign source — especially Slav — is there ever any arbitrary characterisation of any person as a Macedonian, or of any region as Macedonia, outside the bounds of Byzantium.

(f) Sporadic reference is made throughout the Byzantine era to Macedonians, and indeed with the specific information that they were descended 'from the race of

---

1. There is an extensive bibliography on Samuel. The most basic studies have been brought together recently by A. Tachiaou, *Το εφήμερο κράτος του Σαμουήλ (976–1018). Προβλήματα και ερωτηματικά* (Thessaloniki 1990) 36–41.
2. See Tachiaou, op.cit. 9–13.

the Macedonians', or from a well-known Macedonia family (Gomostes), or that they are related to some Macedonian person of note. This means that the Byzantines were aware of the presence of the Macedonians in the specific geographical area in the past, and that they kept alive the memory of their continuity and succession within the context of the new 'Romaio-Christian' race.

(g) It is obvious that often the Byzantines mention the 'race' of the Macedonians for a purpose: to show up the difference between them and other peoples living around them or in their midst. And the people not identified with the Macedonians — most of them living side by side with the Greeks in the region — are mainly the Slavs.

In light of the above, when talking today about contemporary Macedonians it would be unhistorical to ignore this Byzantine tradition and to seek to connect them directly with antiquity. The Macedonians of today are the successors of the Macedonians of Byzantium. Consciously or not, they preserve the long Byzantine tradition which was formed in this region and which regarded as Macedonians all the Byzantine citizens of Macedonia.

Johannes Irmscher

The image of Macedonia as found in Byzantine historians

The region of Macedonia including Thessaloniki, the second capital of the republic and one of the most important parts of the modern Greek state, has borne the stamp of Greek culture through the centuries.[1] Greek culture prevailed there also even in the times of ξενοκρατία and was strong enough to assimilate and to hellenize foreign peoples who came from the north and settled in the region of Macedonia. In 148 BC Macedonia became a province of the Roman Empire.[2] The Roman authors reflected popular opinion in praising the nobility and the military competence of the Macedonians.[3] As a Roman province Macedonia enjoyed a period of prosperity: good roads improved the links with other parts of the Empire, and Roman skill in agriculture brought an economic boom.[4] With the division of the Empire in 395, Macedonia (which in the meantime had been christianized) became part of the eastern empire and remained a very important region of the Byzantine state until its end. In considering the image of Macedonia reflected by the historians, we must always bear in mind that not only the scholars who wrote history but also their readers — at least in principle — had the opportunity of travelling to Macedonia and of scrutinizing the scene of its history. Travel in the Byzantine Empire was a normal and necessary activity among merchants, civil servants, officers and soldiers in particular, but also among clergymen and pilgrims — despite numerous difficulties such as warfare, piracy, brigandage, shipwrecks, and a lack of hostels.[5] For Macedonia it was fortunate that the Via Egnatia, built in the time of the Roman Republic, traversed the whole region. It began on the Adriatic coast at Dyrrachion and Apollonia (nowadays in Albania) and reached Thessaloniki, the seat of the Roman governor. During the principate the road was extended to the river Hebros (modern Marica). From this point there were two ways of travelling to Constantinople, either following the coast along the Sea of Marmara or via Adrianople (modern Edirne in Turkey).[6]

In the age of Justinian Macedonia was divided into two provinces, Macedonia Salutaris with its capital Thessaloniki and Macedonia II with its capital Stobi. The reason for this measure was twofold, firstly the relatively flourishing economy of the region and secondly the danger of hostile raids, especially from the Slavs north

1. In such a way the title of the book edited by M.B. Sakellariou, *Macedonia, 4000 years of Greek history and civilization* (Athens 1983; hereafter '*Macedonia*') is legitimate.
2. F. Papazoglou, "Political and administrative developments" *Macedonia* 193.
3. J. Irmscher, *Quid auctores Romani de Macedonibus nuntiaverint* (*Commentarii Academiae Latinitati fovendae* V-VI, Rome 1994-5) 17f.
4. Papazoglou, loc.cit. 199.
5. *ODB* III 2109.
6. *Lexikon der Antike* ed. J. Irmscher (10th ed., Leipzig 1990; hereafter '*Lexikon*') 620.

Byzantine Macedonia. Identity Image and History. Edited by John Burke & Roger Scott (*Byzantina Australiensia* 13, Melbourne 2000).

of the Danube.[1] This danger became reality with the Slavonic settlement during the late sixth and seventh centuries. In this period Macedonia in fact was divided: the Slavs controlled the countryside and upland regions, while Byzantines retained possession of most of the towns.[2] The inhabitants of Thessaloniki saw the rescue of their town as a miracle of St. Demetrios, the μεγαλομάρτυς, who suffered the death of a martyr under Diocletian at the beginning of the fourth century and had ever since been revered especially in Thessaloniki.[3] In my opinion it was one of the greatest achievements of the Greek people that within a short period most of the Slavonic tribes were integrated into the empire. Beginning with the upper classes, they were hellenized and christianized. It is no wonder that the apostles of the Slavs, Constantine-Cyril and Methodios, were born in Macedonia in the beginning of the ninth century and knew Slavonic perfectly.[4]

With the cultural assimilation of the Slavs in Macedonia there began a period of power and prosperity for the capital and its hinterland.[5] In 867 with Basil I the so-called Macedonian dynasty began its rule which lasted until 1056. But Basil was of Armenian origin and his family lived in Thrace or Macedonia.[6] Thus the dynasty had no special importance for Macedonia. However Basil II (976–1025) who was called Βουλγαροκτόνος, the Bulgar-Slayer, restored Byzantine rule in the Balkans and also in Italy.[7] It was not possible to hold this position of a great power permanently; Italy was conquered by the Normans, and in the East the Turks occupied parts of Asia Minor; but Macedonia in the epoch of the Komnenoi (1081–1185) remained firmly under Byzantine domination.[8] A catastrophe, however, occurred when the Venetians in 1204 undertook the Fourth Crusade against Constantinople, ending Greek control of Byzantium and installing a western feudal system. The essential part of Macedonia now belonged to the newly established Kingdom of Thessaloniki[9] with a Frankish ruler. In the last East-Roman period, at the time of the restoration of the Byzantine state Thessaloniki again came under Greek control, first by the Despotate of Epirus and then by the Empire of Nicaea.[10] But this restored empire, and likewise the empire of the Palaiologoi in Constantinople, were only shadows of the former world power.[11] Throughout its history Macedonia was thus an important part of the Byzantine Empire and hostile raids, insurrections and revolts were not ever able to destroy this adherence.

---

1. G. Ostrogorsky, *Geschichte des byzantinischen Staates* (2nd ed., Munich 1992) map 1.
2. *ODB* II 1261.
3. *Dix mille saints*, ed. M. Stroobants (Turnhout 1991) 142.
4. R. Browning, "Intellectual life" *Macedonia* 264f.
5. H. Ahrweiler, "Political history" *Macedonia* 272; cf. Andreas Schminck in: Byzantine Makedonia, Programme, Melbourne, 1995, p.38
6. *ODB* II 1262.
7. Ostrogorsky, loc.cit. map 3.
8. Ostrogorsky, loc.cit. map 4.
9. Ostrogorsky, loc.cit. map 5.
10. J. Karayannopulos, "Political history" *Macedonia* 308f.
11. Ostrogorsky loc.cit. map 6.

Likewise the historians always had opportunities for personal contact with Macedonians directly or indirectly.

Byzantine historiography finds a threefold expression. A real Christian invention was the Church History, Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία. Forerunners may have been the *Acta apostolorum*, the canonical and the non-canonical, but a real beginning is marked by the work of Eusebios, bishop of Caesarea in Palestine; his ecclesiastical history covers the period from Jesus Christ to the year 324,[1] when Constantine became ruler of the whole empire. There is a continuous line of church historians from Eusebios to the end of antiquity;[2] in the sixth century this type of historiography ends abruptly. A solitary revival in the 14th century is provided by Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos who treated the genre anew. But in the meantime a substitute for ecclesiastical history had developed in the form of hagiography. In our context I refer to the *Miracula Sancti Demetrii*, our main source for the invasions of the Avars and Slavs.[3]

The hagiographic texts found their readers among the large groups of citizens who were able to read but did not have the higher, classical education, namely the middle and lower classes, and naturally the monks and other spiritual persons. The same groups were interested in the world chronicles whose narratives extended from the creation of the world till their own epoch. The language of these works was close to colloquial Greek, and the world-view of their authors corresponded with Byzantine orthodoxy. Byzantine chronicles formed a part of the trivial literature of their time.[4] The χρονογράφοι were very liberal in the use of their sources, and their value for the historian often depends on the material they used.

These sources represent Byzantine historiography par excellence. Their authors wrote *Zeitgeschichte*, in effect contemporary history, covering also the preceding epochs in order to provide a full understanding of the present time. Some of these authors held high political positions and therefore their works have often an apologetic character. In any case they had a classical education and tried to use the language and style of the fifth century BC. Their models were the classical historians such as Thucydides and Xenophon.

To examine how Macedonia is reflected in Byzantine history, we have to consider two facts. First, we have to remember that, until the Fourth Crusade, Macedonia was an important, inseparable part of the Greek empire of Constantinople and had always contributed much to Byzantine culture; the Macedonian Renaissance, for example, is regarded as the beginning of art and literature after the era of Iconoclasm.[5] Second, we have to consider that each of the three types of historiography has its specific rules about content and literary form. In all Church History from Eusebios to Evagrius there are items concerning

1. *Lexikon* 125.
2. T. Sinko, *Literatura grecka* (Wroclaw 1954) 3.2 (348f).
3. J. Karayannopulos & G. Weiss, *Quellenkunde zur Geschichte von Byzanz (324–1453)* (Wiesbaden 1982) II 302f.
4. Hunger, *Lit.* 257.
5. K. Onasch, *Liturgie und Kunst der Ostkirche in Stichworten* (Leipzig 1981) 321f.

Macedonia and the Macedonians,[1] but more important and more productive are the *Miracula Sancti Demetrii* mentioned above.

This collection of the miracles connected with Demetrios, the saint of Thessaloniki, a component of a real *Corpus Demetrianum*,[2] is divided into two parts. The first part contains thirteen sermons relating to events of the years 580–610 which are described by an eye-witness. The second part, written at the end of the seventh century, describes events from 614–640 (chapters 1–3) and 674–85 (chapters 4–6).[3] The texts can be found in the *Acta sanctorum* for 4 October, St. Demetrios' day.[4] There is no doubt that for the hagiographer the cult and the miracles of St. Demetrios form the centre of the narratives, but these narratives took as their background the whole history of Macedonia, and the pious reader or hearer learned the history as seen under this religious aspect. But since the author (or the redactor) had a keen interest in history, the religious aspect aften receded or turned into the historical one. In such a sense the devil, ὁ πάντων ἐχθρὸς ὁ ἀρχαῖος, makes use of an interpreter in order to confuse the situation (εὕρειν ὄργανον τῆς αὐτοῦ ἀπώλειας),[5] and God himself has to intervene. Such an intervention, brought about through prayer by day and by night, corresponds to the divine οἰκονομία due to the παντοδύναμον τοῦ Θεοῦ[6]. This οἰκονομία is appropriate to τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ φιλανθρωπίας τὸ μέγεθος[7]. Because God is ruler of all, creator, and philanthropic (ὁ πάντων δεσπότης καὶ δημιουργὸς καὶ φιλάνθρωπος Θεός)[8]; and thanks to Christ, our God, the enemies were driven away (χάριτι Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν διώχθησαν).[9]

In the centre of all reports we naturally find St. Demetrios. According to these accounts he belonged to a noble family and, appropriate to this birth, he attained high office in Roman society before his martyrdom: Ὁ μακαριώτατος Δημήτριος ἐκ γένους τῶν περιδόξων, καὶ τῆς συγκλήτου βουλῆς ὑπάρχων, ἐκσκέπτωρ τὸ πρῶτον στρατευσάμενος, καὶ ἀνθύπατος γεγονὼς Ἑλλάδος, καὶ ὑπάτου ὡρατίωνα ἔλαβεν ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως Μαξιμιανοῦ.[10] As patron saint of Thessaloniki Demetrios is called Ἀθλοφόρος, the man who gained the prize — the word is already used in the Homeric *Iliad* and also in reference to other martyrs.[11] In a special passage the πανένδοξος μάρτυς is

1. For example Eusebius, *Werke* I 1: *Über das Leben des Kaisers Konstantin* ed. F. Winkelmann (2nd ed., Berlin 1995) 164 (Alexander the Great = ὁ Μακεδών).
2. P. Lemerle, "La composition et la chronologie des deux premiers livres des Miracula S. Demetrii" *BZ* 46 (1953) 349.
3. Karayannopulos & Weiss, op.cit. 309.
4. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica* I 558; PG 116 1088f.
5. AASS 174; V. Tăpkova-Zaimova, *Fontes Graeci historiae Bulgaricae*, ed. I. Dujcev et al. (Sofija 1959) 4.69 (III 144).
6. AASS 149; *Fontes* 14.122 (119).
7. AASS 115; *Fontes* 3.33 (98).
8. AASS 174; *Fontes* 4.72 (145).
9. AASS 140; *Fontes* 12.103 (113); I am following the Bulgarian translation.
10. AASS 90; *Fontes* 89; cf. O. Rühle, *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* ed. H. Gunkel & L. Zscharnack (2nd ed.,Tubingen 1927) I 1823f.
11. LSJ 33.

called ὑπέρμαχος καὶ φιλόπατρις ὄντως;[1] the attribute καλλίνικος[2] points in the same direction. Yet more concrete is the characterization of the saint as ὑπερασπιστὴς τῆς πόλεως[3], i.e. τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης (cf. ἀειμνήστου καὶ προστάτου καὶ λυτρωτοῦ τῆς πόλεως ἡμῶν Δημητρίου).[4] So the people of Thessaloniki ask: Τί σοι τῷ μεγάλῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ στρατιώτῃ; Τί σοι τῷ συμπαθεστάτῳ καὶ φιλοπατρίδι ἀντιδοίημεν;[5] In fact, the inhabitants of Thessaloniki are aware of this rescue by God and by St. Demetrios.[6] Usually the enemies are described as barbarians, though in other cases the author varies between Slavs, Avars, Illyrians and others.

The legend of St. Demetrios arose at a time when Macedonia was threatened by foreign, barbarian tribes. The reading of the Βίος and of the Θαύματα of the patron saint of Thessaloniki was a real encouragement for the people of Macedonia, who were considered Ῥωμαῖοι in spite of their different ethnic origin. The people beyond the frontier of the empire were taken for barbarians, dangerous for the Romans and especially for the Macedonians. God himself and St. Demetrios protected the metropolis, Macedonia, and the Empire.

John Malalas, of Syrian origin, c. 491–578, represents the universal chronicler par excellence.[7] It is the first Byzantine work of this type and as such it exercised great influence on later chronicles and was translated into Church Slavonic and Georgian.[8] The author begins with the Old Testament and Oriental history, then follows the history of the Roman kings and the successors of Alexander the Great. The history of the Roman emperors marks the transition to Byzantine history. For us it is of interest how the historian who is writing for a wide public reflects Macedonian history before the Roman rule.

Malalas made use of many sources, which are difficult to find,[9] and it was impossible for him to develop an integrated chronology. Thus the rise of the Macedonian kingdom is narrated twice. The seventh book of the Χρονογραφία is entitled Περὶ κτίσεως Ῥώμης ('Concerning the Building of Rome'). At the end of this book we read a special version of the Alexander myth. Nectanebo II, the last king of the 30th Egyptian dynasty and thus the last independent Egyptian ruler, was defeated by the king of Persia in 341 BC, and Nectanebo was obliged to flee –

1. AASS 164; *Fontes* 1.164 (131f).
2. AASS 182f. *Fontes* 5.203 (163).
3. AASS 183; *Fontes* 5.205 (164).
4. AASS 184; *Fontes* 5.207(165).
5. AASS 188f; *Fontes* 5.215 (163).
6. AASS 174; *Fontes* 4.96f (154).
7. Malal.; Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica* I 329; cf. B. Croke, "Malalas, the man and his work" *Studies in John Malalas* ed. E. Jeffreys, B. Croke & R. Scott (*ByzAus* 5, Melbourne 1990) 1–25.
8. *ODB* II 1275.
9. Hunger, *Lit.* 322f; cf. E. Jeffreys, "Malalas' sources" *Studies in John Malalas* 167–216; eadem, "Chronological structures in the chronicle" op.cit. 111–166; eadem, "Malalas' use of the past" Reading the Past in Late Antiquity ed. G.W. Clarke et al. (Canberra 1990) 121–46; R. Scott, "Malalas' view of the Classical Past" op.cit. 147–64.

to Nubia. According to a tradition he disappeared there.[1] But Malalas made use of another version. Nectanebo, he wrote, took refuge in Pella, the capital of Macedonia. Here he had a love affair with the princess Olympia who gave birth to Alexander. The chronographer reports that another tradition also exists, according to which Alexander was begotten by Zeus Ammon.[2] Later there follow reports about Jewish and other Oriental happenings. Thereafter Malalas returns to Macedonia. Referring to Eusebios, the church historian of the time of Constantine the Great, he mentions king Philip who founded Thessaloniki and was succeeded by his son Alexander[3] — the episode of Nectanebo is forgotten

Book 8 is entitled "The Times of the Macedonians", an epoch which was obviously important for the author or rather for his forerunners. The decisive personality of this epoch was Alexander, who in the introduction is presented as founder of Alexandria and other cities, as organizer of a large army, as conqueror of the Persian kingdom, as descendant of Achilles.[4] This statement leads to the particularities of the *Historia Alexandri* which is based on several traditions. All is written in a naive, popular style.[5]

The mother of Alexander is correctly named Olympias and her son is compared with a panther for his military successes. He achieved the kingdom of the whole world, as was formulated by the "very wise Bothios"[6]. He may be the χρονογράφος[7] who is mentioned in the Armenian translation of the chronicle of Eusebios for the time of Domitian.[8] The monarchy is regarded by Malalas — and by all Byzantine chronographers — as the best form of government. Thus it was very important for him to state that Alexander was the legitimate heir of the Persian kingdom and also in some way of the Indian kingdom. From Adam till the death of Alexander 'the Macedonian' there were 5593 years according to Theophilos,[9] a χρονογράφος of the third century AD.[10]

Furthermore in the ensuing narrative Alexander is called Macedonian. After his death the empire was divided into four kingdoms, which were governed by the Macedonian generals of Alexander. "Macedonia and all Europe" were ruled by Philip, Alexander's brother.[11]

The end of Macedonian liberty and its conquest by the Romans is the next episode of interest for Malalas.[12] The report is full of errors. The victorious consul

---

1. *Der Kleine Pauly* ed. K. Ziegler & W. Sontheimer (Munich 1972) IV 41.
2. Malal.189.
3. Malal.190f.
4. Malal.192f.
5. Hunger, *Lit.* 323f.
6. Malal. 193.
7. Ioannes Albertus Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca* ed. G.C. Harles (2nd ed., Hamburg 1801) VII 444.
8. Eusebius, *Werke* 7: *Die Chronik des Hieronymus* ed. R. Helm (2nd ed., Berlin 1956) 192.
9. Malal. 195.
10. *Paulys Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Stuttgart, 1934) V 2170.
11. Malal.195f.
12. Malal. 208.

Lucius Aemilius Lucii filius Marci nepos Paullus[1] is called Μάγνος ὁ καὶ Παῦλος ὁ Μακεδών (Magnus Paulus the Macedonian). But the Roman general was not of Macedonian origin, and what should have been written was Μακεδονικός, the conqueror of Macedonia.[2] The Macedonian king, Perseus, was not killed in the battle, as Malalas reports,[3] but escaped at first to Samothrace, where he was imprisoned by his enemies.[4] Malalas notes in a short statement that the consul occupied the Macedonian land and made it a Roman province.[5] Only the later division of this province into *Macedonia Prima et Macedonia Secunda* seemed remarkable to him.[6]

Let us sum up our observations: Malalas who was not of Greek origin, but was educated in the Greek παιδεία, wrote his chronicle in Antioch and (for the last portion) in Constantinople, both far from Macedonia. He did not make a special study of the history and the contemporary situation of this important epoch of the Roman Empire. According to his sources, and obviously also in his own opinion, the universal kingdom of Alexander the Great was the major Macedonian contribution to world history and world civilization. Malalas collected the facts and avoided any judgement. He had no doubt that Macedonia was Greek. His chronicle was used by most of his successors, and his image of Alexander the 'Macedonian' and his state put its stamp on ideas about Macedonia for later generations.[7]

As an example of the learned historiography I refer to the chronicle of John Zonaras (first half of the 12th century). This choice demands an explanation. For Zonaras' work fully represents the type of universal chronicle which Malalas had initiated, and indeed we find all the pecularities of this type of historiography;[8] the author, who had a classical education, was an experienced writer in many branches of literature and belonged for a long time to the officers of the court. Like Malalas and other chroniclers he wrote also about contemporary history in so far as his chronicle extended to the year 1118. Zonaras' book was widely circulated; we know of more than 70 manuscripts as well as translations into Slavonic and, in the Renaissance, into Latin, French and Italian.[9]

Zonaras reports extensively on Macedonia, more than other Byzantine historians.[10] In an historical survey about the old kingdoms Zonaras, following the prophet Daniel, gives an important position to the Macedonian kingdom. Its

---

1. T. Mommsen & C. Huelsen, *Inscriptiones Latinae antiquissimae* (2nd ed., Berlin 1893) II 194.
2. E. Chilmead, Malal. 551f.
3. Malal. 208f.
4. H. Bengtson, *Grundriss der römischen Geschichte* (Munich 1967) I 129.
5. Malal. 209.
6. Malal. 261.
7. Later users of Malalas are listed in I.E. Karagiannopoulos, *Πηγαὶ τῆς βυζαντινῆς ἱστορίας* (2nd ed., Thessaloniki 1971) 143; R. Scott, "The Byzantine Chronicle after Malalas" Studies in John Malalas 38–54.
8. Hunger, *Lit.* 418; Scott, op.cit. 47–8.
9. Hunger, *Lit.* 418.
10. There is a useful register compiled by T. Büttner-Wobst in Zon., "Indices".

destiny was to end Persian rule,[1] and again according to the prophecy of the Old Testament he uses the picture of a panther for Macedonia and correspondingly for Alexander, for his speed and his agility.[2] Only the Romans created a greater empire.[3] In the frame of Persian history seen by the prophet Daniel, the χρονογράφος tells the origin and the life of king Alexander, using as an additional source the classical biography of Plutarch[4] (c. AD 46 – after 120), a work of high literary rank and of reasonable judgements. The history of the Diadochoi is essentially narrated according to the emphasis of the Jewish historian Josephus: for him Macedonia was distant and without special interest.[5]

In the second part of his chronicle Zonaras pursues the development of the Roman Empire; his main source is Cassius Dio, a high imperial officer, who wrote a Roman history in Greek from Creation to the year AD 229. The first Macedonian personality to be mentioned by Zonaras is king Philip V[6] (born 238, king 221–179).[7] He made a pact with Hannibal by which Carthage was to take Italy and Philip would take Greece and the islands[8] but an internal revolt, which threatened his kingdom,[9] prevented his intervention. The historian narrates in detail the war and the rule of Philip.[10] He was followed by his son Perseus[11] (born 212, king 179–168).[12] Zonaras describes the fate of the last Macedonian king from the Roman standpoint of his source. The victory over Perseus and the annexation of Macedonia seemed not as important as the fact that Macedonia was the state of Philip and of Alexander. The defeated Perseus with his family was brought to Italy. Remembering that he had defeated twenty kings and remembering his forefathers, Philip and Alexander, for some time Perseus hoped to return to Macedonia. But when he felt that such a hope was treacherous he killed himself.[13] Saving his honour he saved the honour of Macedonia.

Macedonia had now become a part of the Roman Empire but, owing to its geopolitical situation, much of Roman domestic policy during the Republic involved Macedonia and Macedonian legions participated in these Roman struggles; besides Dio, the pertinent biographies of Plutarch were used as sources by Zonaras. The high position of Macedonia at the time of the transition from Republic to Empire is marked by the fact that, before the decisive battle of Philippi

1. Zon. I 212.
2. Zon. I 255f.
3. Zon. I 227.
4. Zon. I 329f.
5. Josephus (2.16.4) has only one item, in a speech of the king Agrippa II (Flavius Josephus, *Geschichte des Judaischen Krieges* ed. H. Kreissig, German tr. H. Clementz (Leipzig 1970), 192; rp. Dreieich 1978,176.)
6. Zon. II 175.
7. *Der Kleine Pauly* IV 748f.
8. Zon. II 208.
9. Zon. II 224.
10. Zon. II 245f.
11. Zon. II 268.
12. Zon. II 652f.
13. Zon. II 276f.

in 42 BC,[1] τέρατα were seen in the capital Rome and in Macedonia.[2] Historians, incidentally, were in the habit of naming Greece and Macedonia side by side (τὴν Ἑλλάδα τήν τε Μακεδονίαν).[3] This is not a segregation of the two regions and peoples, but an acknowledgment that historically Macedonia was not less important than the nuclear country of Greece.

Like all Byzantine historians, Zonaras was a supporter of the monarchy and therefore gave a detailed biography of the emperor Augustus, making use of sources unknown to us.[4] He tried to clarify the chronology of Jesus Christ, our Lord and God (ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν καὶ θέος), who was born under Augustus.[5] Augustus was important for the Byzantine χρονογράφος, but even more important for him was Constantine the Great, ὁ ἐν βασιλεῦσιν ἀοίδιμος καὶ ἐν ὀρθοδόξοις ἐπισημότατος [6] (glorious among Kings and most distinguished among the Orthodox). Of interest is his report that Licinius, defeated by Constantine, could live at first as a private man in Thessaloniki,[7] until the soldiers demanded his death. We learn too that Constantine, ὁ τρισόλβιος βασιλεύς, divided his empire into three parts, a part for each of his sons. Illyricum and Macedonia was allotted to Constans, and also the Peloponnese with Hellas.[8]

The emperor Valens (364–78) is given a bad report by Zonaras or his source. He admitted pagan sacrifices, was indulgent to the Jews, and had supported Arianism. He was threatened by the Σκύθαι (the barbarians generally), who invaded Thrace and Macedonia.[9] Some years later there was a big riot in Thessaloniki, which Zonaras connected — obviously wrongly— with the usurper Eugenius. Theodosios II (408–450) put the riot down violently and was sentenced by Ambrose, archbishop of Milan, to do penance.[10]

The next text relating to Macedonia is linked with the emperor Anastasios II who reigned only one year and three months (713–15).[11] After a revolt of the troops he abdicated, became a monk, and was exiled to Thessaloniki.[12] A few years later in 719 a certain Niketas Xylinitas, a μάγιστρος, and so a person of influence, advised Artemios, which was the baptismal name of Anastasios II, who at that time[13] was studying in Thessaloniki, to try to regain the throne with the help of the Bulgarians. But the conspiracy was betrayed by the Bulgarians who had come to

1. Bengtson, op.cit. 240f.
2. Zon. II 360f.
3. For example Zon. II 396.
4. Zon. II 428.
5. Zon. II 431.
6. Zon. III 1.
7. Zon. III 5f.
8. Zon. III 26.
9. Zon. III 77.
10. Zon. III 85f.
11. Zon. III 247.
12. *ODB* I 87.
13. Ibid.

Constantinople; Artemios-Anastasios and Niketas were killed with the other conspirators, including the archbishop of Thessaloniki.[1]

The so-called Macedonian dynasty began with Basil I[2] (867–86) and the new emperor is correctly named Βασίλειος ὁ Μακεδών.[3] For this dynasty also is characterized by the historians of the modern Enlightenment as "a tissue of rebellions, insurrections and treachery" (Montesquieu).[4] In addition to these internal problems a mighty enemy threatened the empire: Symeon, the czar of the Bulgarians (893–927). Zonaras tells us that the foreign ruler with his enormous army devastated Macedonia and Thrace before he beseiged the capital.[5] Basil II (976–1025) was faced with a similar situation.[6] He first had to come to an arrangement with the "tyrant" Bardas Skleros in 989;[7] and when freed from the anxiety of losing his throne, the emperor came to Thessaloniki in order to thank the glorious saint of the town. He left there a responsible officer (στρατάρχης τῶν ἐπισήμων) with a large number of troops to prevent further raids from the Bulgars.[8] But after their czar Samuel, who had become more and more bold, devastated not only Thessaloniki and Macedonia but all of Greece,[9] the emperor repelled the invaders and destroyed Samuel's empire.[10]

In the midst of the eleventh century a riot arose in Macedonia under the leadership of Leo Tornikios (Tornikes), probably an Armenian in origin who lived in Adrianople.[11] Zonaras notes that Tornikios had many followers in Macedonia, who were discontent with the military policy of the emperor. They brought Tornikios to Adrianople, welcomed him as their ruler and then repeated their acclamations in the hippodrome of Constantinople. Zonaras underlines that all this was the work of Macedonians, who were characterized as βωμολοχίας ὄντες ἐθάδες,[12] accustomed to rebellions. Although the riot failed, the incident demonstrates the military weakness of the Byzantine administration in this area in which the bureaucracy of the capital dominated. Another example was later given by the Patzinaks (Πατζινάκοι),[13] who incessantly devastated Macedonia and Thrace.[14] In such a critical time there was a need for someone like the successful general of Macedonian forces Nikephoros Bryennios; but he was inclined to

1. Zon. III 256.
2. Ostrogorsky, op.cit. 458.
3. Zon. III 407.
4. Ostrogorsky, op.cit. 4f.
5. Zon. III 471.
6. *ODB* III 1911.
7. Zon. III 557.
8. Zon. III 558.
9. Ostrogorsky, op.cit. 248f.
10. Ostrogorsky, op.cit. 265.
11. Zon. III 626f.
12. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica* II 247.
13. Zon. III 644.
14. Zon. III 657.

rebellion.[1] Already in the next generation the Uzes (Οὖζοι [2]) crossed the Danube, defeated the Byzantine troops, plundered Macedonia and spread through all of Greece.[3] The invasion was repeated in the reign of Constantine X (1054–1067). The Byzantine commander Nestor joined the leader of the Patzinaks, disregarding the orders of the emperor. The invaders devastated Thrace, Macedonia and the adjacent territories.[4] In the year 1077 the throne of Byzantium had two aspirants, Nikephoros Botaneiates who revolted in the east, and Nikephoros Bryennios in the Balkans.[5] The latter persuaded the Macedonian soldiers, among others, to join him.[6] However his rival became emperor as Nikephoros III Botaneiates, but only for a few years, as in 1081 he abdicated in favour of Alexios I, the founder of the Komnenan dynasty. The civil war continued, during which many soldiers were killed and others captured.[7] And the more the empire was displaced from Asia Minor, the more the importance of Thessaloniki increased as a meeting point for statesmen.[8] There was no end of civil wars (πόλεμοι πρὸς τοὺς ὁμοφύλους), lamented by the historian Zonaras,[9] and there was also no end of riots and plundering.[10]

Zonaras was a real historian, who combined χρονογραφία with contemporay history. He was cultured enough to view his material critically. For him, as for all Byzantines, monarchy was the only legitimate form of government and the sequence of empires according to the doctrine of the biblical Daniel was the basis for his philosophy of history. This philosophy was a critical one, and was critical also with respect to the emperors and high officials. Macedonia had no special interest for him. It was an integral part of the empire with Thessaloniki an important capital, but it was more and more threatened by people beyond the frontiers, barbarians in the view of Zonaras. In contrast to the Roman historians who often praised the Macedonians, Zonaras remained reserved in his judgements.

To sum up, throughout Byzantine history with its imperial ideology, Macedonia remained an inseparable part of the empire from beginning to end. Nobody could doubt this continuity and it would have been absurd to call the Macedonians barbarians. King Alexander the Great was a figure of integration for all Macedonians. This I think, is a useful lesson for our time.

---

1. *ODB* I 330f.
2. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica* II 228.
3. Zon. III 678.
4. Zon. III 713f.
5. *ODB* III 1479.
6. Zon. III 716.
7. Zon. III 717.
8. On Thessaloniki as a place for international meetings see for example Zon. III 720, 732, 750.
9. Zon. III 728f.
10. Zon. III 740 (again the Petchanegs).

Andreas Schminck

The beginnings and origins of the 'Macedonian' dynasty

"In the thirtieth year of his age, and inthe hour of intoxication and sleep, Michael the Third was murdered in his chamber by the founder of a new dynasty, whom the emperor had raised to an equality of rank and power."[1] Much more detailed than this statement by Edward Gibbon in his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* is J.B. Bury's description in his *History of the Eastern Roman Empire from the Fall of Eirene to the Accession of Basil the First*:

> Basil struck the blow on Sept. 24, 867. Michael had bidden him and Eudocia to dinner in the Palace of St. Mamas. When Michael had drunk deeply, Basil made an excuse to leave the room, and entering the Imperial bed-chamber tampered with the bolts of the door so that it could not be locked. He then returned to the table, and when the Emperor became drunk as usual, he conducted him to his bed and kissing his hand went out. The Keeper of the Private Wardrobe, who was accustomed to sleep in the Emperor's room, was absent on a commission, and Basiliskianos had been commanded to take his place. Michael sank on his bed in the deep sleep of intoxication ... Basil had engaged the help of eight friends, some of whom had taken part in his first crime, the murder of Bardas. Accompanied by these, Basil opened the door of the bed-chamber, and was confronted by the chamberlain, who opposed his entrance. One of the conspirators ... wounded Basiliskianos and hurled him on the floor, while [another], John Chaldos (who had been prominent among the slayers of Bardas) hewed at the sleeping Emperor with his sword, and cut off both his hands ... The conspirators [then] consulted whether their victim should be despatched outright. One of them took it upon himself to return to the bed where Michael was moaning out piteous imprecations against Basil, and ripped up his body. Through the darkness of a stormy night the assassins rowed across the Golden Horn ... [and entered] the Great Palace ... Such is the recorded story of the final act which raised Basil the Macedonian to supreme power.[2]

But this is not only a crime story but also a sex story or at least a love story.

Liutprand of Cremona, who stayed at Constantinople in the tenth century when Basil's grandson Constantine VII was in power, wrote the following:

> The August Emperor Basil, the present emperor's grandfather, was born of a humble family in Macedonia. Under the compelling yoke of poverty (τῆς πτωχείας) he came down to Constantinople and was for a

1. E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* ch. 48, ed. J.B. Bury (London 1912) V 214–5.
2. Bury, *ERE* 177–9.

Byzantine Macedonia.: Identity Image and History. Edited by John Burke & Roger Scott (*Byzantina Australiensia* 13, Melbourne 2000).

> time servant to an abbot (ἡγούμενος). The then Emperor Michael went one morning to pray in the monastery where Basil was serving and, seeing that he was exceptionally comely, called the abbot and asked him to give him the lad. He then took him off to the palace and made him his chamberlain; and in a little time he became so powerful that everyone called him the second emperor.[1]

The young peasant's *forma egregia* which charmed the young emperor is confirmed by the Greek sources, and especially by the *Vita Basilii*, Basil's *Life* written by his grandson Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos:

> The abbot introduced Basil to the little Theophilos ... who endeavoured to be surrounded by excellent, beautiful (εὐειδεῖς) men of good stature, who distinguished themselves in particular by manliness and strength of body, and to be presumptuous and proud of them; you could see that such men were immediately equipped with silken robes and caught the eye with their other equipment. Theophilos placed the young newcomer Basil among these people, and as he seemed to surpass the others greatly in respect of bodily strength and spiritual manliness, he was appointed *protostrator*, i.e. first master of the horse, by Theophilos who loved (ἠγαπᾶτο) him more and more day after day and worshipped him for his superior qualities.[2]

Basil's protector Theophilitzes then introduced him to Michael III by telling the emperor that Basil would be able to catch Michael's intractable horse that had run away. Constantine described it as follows:

> When the emperor ordered that this should be done, Basil executed it willingly and in a shapely manner (εὐφυῶς). The emperor wondered about that and began to love (ἀγαπήσας) his shapeliness (εὐφυίαν) with manliness and his sagacity so that he at once took him away from

---

1. Liutprand of Cremona, *Antapodosis* ed. J. Bekker (Hannover-Leipzig 1915) 1.8: "Basilius imperator augustus, avus huius, Macedonia humili fuerat prosapia oriundus, descenditque Constantinopolim τῆς πτωχείας, quod est paupertatis iugo, ut cuidam serviret ἡγουμένῳ, id est abbati. Igitur imperator Michahel, qui tunc temporis erat, cum orationis gratia ad monasterium istud, in quo hic ministrabat, descenderet, vidit hunc forma praeter ceteros egregia, accitumque τὸν ἡγούμενον, abbatem, rogavit, ut se donaret hoc puero; quem suscipiens in palatio, cubicularii donavit officio. Tantae denique post paululum potestatis est factus, ut alter ab omnibus imperator sit apellatus."
2. Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos, "Vita Basilii", *TheophCont* 225.1–12: τούτῳ συνέστησε τὸν Βασίλειον ὁ ἡγούμενος· ἐτύγχανε γάρ πως τὸ Θεοφιλίδιον τοῦτο... εἰς σπουδὴν ἔχον γενναίους ἄνδρας καὶ εὐειδεῖς καὶ εὐήλικας καὶ ἐπ' ἀνδρίᾳ μάλιστα καὶ ῥώμῃ σώματος διαφέροντας κεκτῆσθαι περὶ αὐτὸν καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις μέγα φρονεῖν καὶ σεμνύνεσθαι· οὓς εὐθὺς ἦν ὁρᾶν σηρικαῖς τε κοσμουμένους ἐσθῆσι καὶ τῇ ἄλλῃ καταστολῇ διαπρέποντας. τούτοις καταλεγέντα τὸν νέηλυν νεανίαν Βασίλειον, καὶ κατὰ πολὺ προέχειν δόξαντα τῶν λοιπῶν κατά τε σωματικὴν ἀλκὴν καὶ ψυχικὴν ἀνδρίαν, πρωτοστράτορα αὐτοῦ πεποίηκεν ὁ Θεόφιλος, καὶ ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας ἐπὶ πλέον ἠγαπᾶτο παρ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς οἰκείοις προτερήμασιν ἐθαυμάζετο.

> Theophilitzes and incorporated him into the imperial masters of the horse. He paid court to him (προσεῖχε) and loved him (ἠγάπα αὐτόν), seeing that he widely excelled the others in every respect. Therefore he raised him, who often had exhibited himself in front of him, to the dignity of first master of the horse.[1]

Some time later, Basil killed the Caesar Bardas, Michael's very powerful uncle, and the reward for this crime was the co-emperor's crown. But before being crowned on 26th May, 866, Basil had to undergo a strange procedure, described by the so-called Genesios who wrote his *History of emperors* at the time and at the court of Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos:

> When the emperor [Michael] once stayed at the palace near the Church of the glorious martyr Mamas, a ludicrous idea came into his mind which he did not tell to all of his entourage. He commanded two servants to undress Basil (ἀπογυμνοῦν τοῦτον) and to stretch his arms ... And Basil, who was youthful, was whipped by the emperor with thirty cuts of the double whip in order to have a written memory of the emperor's tender love (φιλοστόργου προθέσεως) for him. At early morn he entered Hagia Sophia and showed the people the crowned emperor ... and passed him the insignia of the co-emperor's dignity. Furthermore he had a deep affection for him (πολὺ φίλτρον), conceding him the same rank (τὰ ἴσα), nay the pre-eminence (ὑπεροχήν).[2]

But after little more than one year Michael's love for Basil ceased. In the *Vita Basilii* this is reported as follows:

> The emperor decided to take another participator in the imperial dignity, namely that so-called Basilikinos, who was one of the emperor's council of murderers, a bad and abominable, effeminate (θηλυδρίαν) person fond of dancing ... who at that time served with the rowers in the imperial trireme. This hateful Basilikinos was once dressed by the

---

1. Op.cit. 231.14–21: τοῦ δὲ βασιλέως ὑπομνησθέντος καὶ κελεύσαντος τοῦτο γενέσθαι, ἑτοίμως καὶ εὐφυῶς ὁ Βασίλειος τοῦτο πεποίηκεν. ὃ θεασάμενος ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ ἀγαπήσας τὴν μετ' ἀνδρίας εὐφυίαν αὐτοῦ καὶ σύνεσιν, εὐθέως ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοφιλίτζη αὐτὸν ἀνέλαβέ τε καὶ εἰς τοὺς βασιλικοὺς κατέταξε στράτορας. προσεῖχε δὲ καὶ ἠγάπα αὐτόν, ὁρῶν αὐτοῦ τὸ πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους ἐν πᾶσι διαφέρον κατὰ πολύ. διὸ καὶ πολλάκις ἐπιδειξάμενον κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν τοῦ πρωτοστράτορος ἀξίαν ἐβίβασε.

2. Genes. 4.27 (ed. Lesmüller-Werner & Thurn 79): Ὡς οὖν περί τινα χρόνον παρῆν ὁ ἄναξ τοῖς περὶ τὸν καλλίνικον Μάμαντα μάρτυρα βασιλείοις, ἐπεφύη τούτῳ σκοπὸς κἂν γελοῖος, ὃν τῶν πρὸς αὐτὸν οὐ πᾶσιν ἐγνώρισεν. ἐγκελεύεται δυσὶ τῶν οἰκείων ... ἀπογυμνοῦν τοῦτον τὼ χεῖρέ τε διατεῖναι. ὁ Βασίλειος ... νεανικὸς ὢν ... μαστίζεται παρ' αὐτοῦ [τοῦ βασιλέως] διπλοῖς ἐν φραγελλίοις λ', μνήμην ἔχειν τοῦτον ἀνάγραπτον τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν φιλοστόργου προθέσεως. καὶ τῷ μεγίστῳ ναῷ ἐπελθὼν πρωΐας αὐτῆς στεφηφόρον ἄνακτα λαοῖς ἀναδείκνυσι ... καὶ τῆς κατὰ δευτερείαν αὐτῷ βασιλείας τὰ πρόσφορα δίδωσιν. ᾧ καὶ πολὺ φίλτρον ἐπιδιδούς, καὶ τὰ ἴσα, πρὸς δὲ καὶ τὰ καθ' ὑπεροχὴν ἐμπαρέχεται.

> emperor with the much-famed imperial purple costume, the conspicuous and enviable crown, the all-golden mantle, the scarlet sandals with precious stones and the other imperial insignia; the emperor took hold of his hand and led him to the senate, at the same time being his boss and servant, as did Nero long ago in respect of the well-known Eros, and spoke these words: "Look here, all of you, and marvel, isn't it fitting that *he* will be emperor? Firstly his shape is worthy of sovereignty, secondly the crown seems to be born with him. All things fit together for this dignity." And also: "How much better it would be, if I had made *him* emperor instead of Basil."[1]

The reason for Basil's murder of Michael was therefore his apprehension about being replaced by a new imperial favourite. With this reference to the Emperor Nero and his favourite, whom Constantine calls Eros instead of Sporos, the author alludes unmistakably to Michael's homoerotic disposition.

We should also note that we should not attribute this mention of Nero's favourite Eros to Plutarch's lost *Vita Neronis*, as did Romilly Jenkins. For the name Eros is to be explained by Constantine's short-comings in quoting by heart a source which is much more likely to be Dio's *Roman History*, surely existing at that period, rather than Plutarch's *Vita Neronis*, which probably had already been lost in antiquity.

So we have to state that the famous Macedonian dynasty owes its existence to Michael III's homosexuality.

But where did Basil come from? Was he a Slav, an Armenian or a Greek? Norman Tobias, who wrote a very good monograph about Basil, was right in rejecting the Slavonic theory of Basil's birth (which is periodically revived) even though the Arab sources are unanimous about his Slavic birth. But the words "Slav" and "Macedonian" were employed synonymously by Arab authorities. Concerning

---

1. Constantine VII, op.cit. 250.5–251.2: Ἐβουλεύσατο γὰρ ἐπεμβαλεῖν τοῖς σκήπτροις καὶ ἕτερον σύγκληρον. καὶ δὴ τὸν κατ' ἐπωνυμίαν Βασιλικῖνον ἐκεῖνον, ἕνα καὶ αὐτὸν τοῦ παλαμναίου συνεδρίου τυγχάνοντα, φαῦλον καὶ μιαρὸν θηλυδρίαν τε καὶ φιλόκωμον... · τότε δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἐλαύνουσιν εἰς τὴν βασιλικὴν τριήρη κατειλεγμένος ἐτύγχανε. τοῦτον δὴ τὸν δυσώνυμον Βασιλικῖνον ἐνδύει ποτὲ τὴν πολυύμνητον βασιλικὴν πορφύραν καὶ τὸν περίοπτον καὶ ἐπίφθονον στέφανον χλαμύδα τε πάγχρυσον καὶ τὰ κοκκοβαφῆ καὶ διάλιθα πέδιλα καὶ τἆλλα τῆς βασιλείας ἐπίσημα, ἐξάγει τε αὐτὸν πρὸς τὴν σύγκλητον τῆς χειρὸς ἅμα κρατῶν καὶ ὑπουργῶν αὐτῷ, ὡς ὁ Νέρων ἐκεῖνος πάλαι τὸν πολυθρύλητον Ἔρωτα, καί φησιν ἐπὶ λέξεως·

> ἴδετε πάντες ὑμεῖς, καὶ θαυμάσατε.
> ἆρα οὐ πρέπει αὐτὸν εἶναι βασιλέα;
> πρῶτον μὲν εἶδος ἄξιον τυραννίδος,
> τὸ δεύτερον δὲ συμφυὲς πέλει στέφος
> ἅπαντα δ' ἁρμόζουσι πρὸς τὴν ἀξίαν.

Καὶ ὅτι πόσον ἦν κάλλιον τοῦτόν με ποιῆσαι βασιλέα ἢ τὸν Βασίλειον;

Basil's possible Armenian origin, Tobias reached the following conclusion: "It can be definitely said that Basil was of Armenian birth and humble origin". This was and is the *communis opinio doctorum*, but I think it is not true. The official version of Basil's origin is given by Constantine VII:

> The Emperor Basil came from the land of the Macedonians but was descended from the Armenian Arsacids. As namely the old Arsacis ruled the Parthians and had gained much glory and fame, it became a custom for the later Parthians, Armenians and also Medes to be governed only by a descendant of the family of Arsacis.[1]

Constantine presents Basil as one of this mythical king's off-springs driven to Macedonia, and Leo VI, Basil's son and successor as well as Constantine's father and predecessor, offers a similar genealogy in his *Λόγος ἐπιτάφιος* for his parents:

> But his birth in the defilement here below led him up to the Arsacids. Who they were cannot be explained here (where we are dealing with praise, not with history), but should be known to writers of history. But (I can say) that they were born from imperial off-spring; for they have the sources of their blood in Artaxerxes' veins, who for a very long time has been magnified by imperial power and who subjugated most of the peoples, whom they gave therefore a remarkable surname, calling him Μακρόχειρα ('Long-armed')... [2]

Comparing these two texts, both written by Basil's own descendants, we become aware of an essential difference. While Constantine stresses the Armenian component of Basil's pretended Arsacid origin, Leo does not mention it at all but stresses Basil's descent from Arsacis' ostensible relative Artaxerxes I. Thus Leo seems to know nothing about Basil's and therefore his own Armenian origin, but claims descent from a Persian βασιλεύς, a very strong argument against the Armenian theory of Basil's origin.

But let us destroy this theory for once and for all. In Niketas David the Paphlagonian's *Vita Ignatii* we read the following:

> What about Lightful (Φώτιος) as he was called? ... All the ten years of his banishment ... he tried to regain the emperor's favour; and

---

1. Op.cit. 212.19–213.2: αὐτοκράτωρ Βασίλειος ὡρμᾶτο μὲν ἐκ τῆς Μακεδόνων γῆς, τὸ δὲ γένος εἵλκεν ἐξ 'Αρμενίων ἔθνους 'Αρσακίων. τοῦ γὰρ παλαιοῦ 'Αρσάκου, ὃς Πάρθων ἡγήσατο, ἐπὶ μέγα δόξης προελθόντος καὶ ἀρετῆς, νόμος τοῖς ὕστερον ἐχρημάτισε μὴ ἄλλοθεν βασιλεύεσθαι μήτε Πάρθους μήτε 'Αρμενίους, ἀλλὰ μηδὲ Μήδους, ἢ παρὰ τοῦ γένους 'Αρσάκου καὶ τῶν ἀπογόνων αὐτοῦ.

2. Leo VI, *Oraison funèbre de Basile I par son fils Léon VI le Sage* ed. A. Vogt & I. Hausherr (Rome 1932) 44 lines 23–30: Πλὴν ἡ κάτω δὴ ταύτῃ τῆς φθορᾶς γένεσις εἰς 'Αρσακίδας αὐτὸν ἀνῆγεν. οὗτοι δὲ τίνες ποτέ εἰσιν, οὐ τοῦ παρόντος διηγεῖσθαι λόγου (οὐ γὰρ ἱστορίαν, ἀλλ' εὐφημίαν ἐργάζεται), γνοῖεν δ' ἂν οἱ τὰς ἱστορίας ἀναλεγόμενοι. πλήν γε ὅτι καὶ αὐτοὶ βασιλείου προῆλθον σπορᾶς· ἕλκουσι γὰρ τοῦ αἵματος τὰς πηγὰς ἐκ τῶν 'Αρταξέρξου ναμάτων, ὃς ἐπὶ μήκιστον χρόνου βασιλείῳ κράτει ἐμεγαλύνθη καὶ πλεῖστα ὅσα τῶν ἐθνῶν πεποίητο ὑπὸ χεῖρα, ᾧ καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐξαίρετον ἐπώνυμον ἔδωσαν τὸν Μακρόχειρα ὀνομάσαντες.

> contriving all kinds of plans and considerations, he eventually found a way by which he triumphed over imperial simplicity or gullibility; and look how convincing and worthy of his spirit it was. Considering all names, the Emperor Basil's, his wife Eudokia's, and his children Constantine's, Leo's, Alexander's and Stephen's names, he took the first letter of every name and composed a new word whereby he started his fraud (ἀπάτης). Inventing a fancy story or rather genealogy, he put Tiridates (III), the great Armenian king at the time of the holy martyr Gregorios (Φωστήρ), as his ancestor (προπάτορα) at the top of the genealogical tree. Then he filled the genealogy up with high-sounding names, making one descend from another in a fictitious story. When Photios finally arrived at Basil's father, he wrote that this one would generate a man like Basil, whose name would be Beklas; and he prophesied that this man would reign as an emperor more successfully and longer than the emperors of all time. Using countless lies (ψεύδεσιν), he knew how to delight Basil's ears and so fabricated this work which he wrote with Alexandrian letters on very old parchment (χαρτίων) in order to imitate archaic hand-writing as well as possible. Then he bound the writing with very old covers removed from a very old book and put it away in the great library of the Imperial Palace.[1]

This testimony seems to be quite reliable because it provides an excellent explanation for Basil's fancy Arsacid origin. Photios who had a very close relationship with Armenia, probably via his mother, could have invented Basil's

---

1. Niketas David Paphlagon, *Vita Ignatii* (PG 105 565B13–568A8): Τί δὲ ὁ λεγόμενος Φώτιος; ... Πάντα δὲ τὸν δεκαετῆ χρόνον τῆς ὑπερορίας... τοῦ βασιλέως ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν τὴν εὔνοιαν ἐπισπάσαθαι μηχανᾶται· καὶ πᾶσαν μὲν βουλήν, πᾶσαν δὲ τριβὴν λογισμῶν πρὸς τοῦτο κινῶν, εὗρεν ὁδὸν λοιπόν, δι' ἧς τῆς ἁπλότητος ἤτοι κουφότητος κατωρχήσατο τῆς βασιλικῆς· καὶ σκοπεῖτε, ὡς πιθανὴν καὶ τῆς ἐκείνου ψυχῆς ἀξίαν. Τῶν ὀνομάτων γὰρ ἕκαστον περισκεψάμενος, αὐτοῦ τε, φημί, Βασιλείου τοῦ βασιλέως, Εὐδοκίας τε τῆς αὐτοῦ γαμετῆς καὶ τῶν παίδων, Κωνσταντίνου, Λέοντος, Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Στεφάνου· ἐξ ἑκάστου δὲ τὸ πρῶτον γράμμα λαβὼν καὶ συντιθείς, ἐντεῦθεν λαμβάνει τῆς ἀπάτης τὴν ἀφορμήν. Ἱστορίαν γὰρ ἤτοι γενεαλογίαν τὴν μήτ' οὖσαν, μήτ' οὖν ποτε γενομένην ἀναπλάσας, Τηριδάτην μὲν ἐκεῖνον τὸν μέγαν Ἀρμενίων βασιλέα, τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἱερομάρτυρος λέγω Γρηγορίου, προπάτορα τίθεται τῷ λόγῳ, ἐξ ἐκείνου δὲ τὴν γενεαλογίαν ὀνόμασιν, οἷς ἠθέλησεν, ἐπισυνείρων καὶ ἄλλους ἐξ ἄλλων τῇ πλασματώδει κατάγων ἱστορίᾳ, ἡνίκα δὴ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα κατῆλθε Βασιλείου, τοῦτον ἔγραψεν, ὡς ἄνδρα γεννήσει τοιοῦτον, οἷος αὐτὸς Βασίλειος ἦν. Τὸ δὲ ὄνομα εἶναι Βεκλᾶς, ὃν εὐτυχέστατα καὶ πολυχρονιώτατα τῶν ἐξ αἰῶνος βεβασιλευκότων βασιλεύσοντα προφητεύει. Μυρίοις δὲ ψεύδεσιν, οἷς ᾔδει γάννυσθαι τοῦτον ἀκούοντα, τὸ σύγγραμμα καταρτισάμενος, ἐπὶ παλαιοτάτων μὲν τοῦτο χαρτίων γράμμασιν Ἀλεξανδρινοῖς, τὴν ἀρχαϊκὴν ὅτι μάλιστα χειροθεσίαν μιμησάμενος, γράφει· ἀμφιέννυσι δὲ καὶ πτύχαις παλαιοτάταις ἐκ παλαιοτάτου βιβλίου ἀφαιρούμενος, κἀντεῦθεν τῇ μεγάλῃ τοῦτο τοῦ παλατίου ἀποτίθεται βιβλιοθήκῃ.

Arsacid genealogy in order to present Tiridates III as a model for Basil, because Tiridates (Trdat), after he had tortured St. Gregorios (Φωστήρ) ended by venerating him — at least according to Agathangelos, who shows a strange accordance with Photios' views: "Then he [Gregorios Φωστήρ] took the men of the Arsacid family and instructed them in the (Christian) doctrine. Of these the foremost was Trdat, who was the king, with all his household."[1] So we cannot separate the Armenian theory from the Arsacid theory by accepting the former while rejecting the latter. On the contrary, we have to consider the Armenian theory of Basil's birth as a product of Photios' fantasy. So it can be definitely said that Basil was of pure Greek birth.

But where did he come from? We can neglect a piece of fourteenth century evidence, according to which Basil was born in Χαριούπολις, and have to be content with the unanimous testimony of nearly all our sources, namely that Basil was born in the rural environs of Adrianople (Edirne).

The question to ask now is whether Basil was a Macedonian. In antiquity and modern times, Adrianople belonged to Thrace, but all scholars agree that in Byzantine times Adrianople was the capital of the theme of Macedonia.[2] This *communis opinio* is based on passages like the following, taken from Pseudo-Symeon Magistros: "This Basil came from Macedonia, from the environs of Adrianople."[3] But Constantine, who mentions Adrianople three times in his *Vita Basilii*, does not say anywhere that Adrianople belonged to Macedonia. On the contrary, in his *De thematibus* he ranged Adrianople with τὸ τῆς Θρᾴκης θέμα, and also in Basil II's *Menologion* from the end of the tenth century we find Adrianople referred to as a town of Thrace.[4]

The confusion begins with Constantine's *Vita Basilii*, where it is said that "Basil set out from Macedonia τῆς Θρᾴκης for Constantinople."[5] I think this confusion is the result of a combination of fact and fiction, the *fact* that Basil originated in the region of Adrianople, a city of *Thrace*, and the *fancy* that Basil was a Macedonian like Philip and Alexander the Great.

This ideology can be found several times in sources of this period, for example in a text from Genesios' *History*, which contains a good deal of propaganda for the Macedonian dynasty. The text reads: "He [Basil] went back also to Philip and Alexander, the excellent rulers, and he originated in the land of the Macedonians,

---

1. Agathangelos, *History of the Armenians* 131, ed. G. Lafontaine, *La version grecque ancienne du livre arménien d' Agathange* (Louvain-la Neuve 1973) 30.1–3: Ἀπὸ τότε οὖν ἀρξάμενος, ἐκέλευσεν [ὁ ἅγιος Γρηγόριος] τὸ τῶν Ἀρσακιδῶν γένος κατὰ σχολὴν πρὸς τὴν θείαν διδασκαλίαν γυμνάζεσθαι· ἐν ᾧ πρῶτος ἦν Τιριδάτιος ὁ βασιλεὺς μετὰ παντὸς τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ.
2. For example Lemerle, *Philippes* 123); Pertusi, *De them.* 158; J. Nesbitt & N. Oikonomides, *Catalogue of Byzantine Seals at Dumbarton Oaks and in the Fogg Museum of Art* (Washington, D.C. 1991) I 110.
3. Pseudo-Symeon Magistros, *Chronography* ed. I. Bekker (1838) 655.19–20: Γέγονε δὲ οὗτος ὁ Βασίλειος ἐκ Μακεδονίας, ἐκ χωρίων τῆς Ἀδριανουπόλεως.
4. *Menologion of Basil II* (PG 117 276D7): εἰς Ἀδριανούπολιν τῆς Θρᾴκης.
5. Constantine VII, op.cit. 223.5–6: Ἆρας οὖν ἐκ Μακεδονίας τῆς Θρᾴκης πρὸς τὴν ἄρχουσαν ... ἐπορεύετο.

born from reputable parents."[1] In the *Vita Basilii* too, Basil is twice compared with Alexander the Great, and so there cannot be any doubt that Basil was called the Macedonian because he wanted to be a new βασιλεύς like Philip and Alexander. Therefore it is not a mere accident that Basil called his first son, who was born after his (definite) accession to the throne, Alexander, a name totally unusual at the time. As Alexander was born about 868 we can assume that Basil's self-stylisation as a Macedonian was invented and propagated just after Basil's assumption of power when he had to justify his illegitimate rule. A peasant from Thrace could not be considered to be ideally suited as a βασιλεὺς τῶν 'Ρωμαίων, but a descendant of a Macedonian βασιλεὺς would have better chances of being generally accepted.

But Photios, who later invented Basil's Armenian genealogy and who, by an interpolation in Theophanes' *Chronology*, transformed the *Syrian* dynasty into a fictitious *Isaurian* dynasty, can hardly be believed to be the author of this piece of unsophisticated imperial ideology since Basil had deposed him as patriarch soon after his seizure of power.

Even though we cannot believe Basil to *be* a Macedonian, we can believe him to have had the *idea* of wanting to be a Macedonian. So let us believe this *honourable man* to be an honorary Macedonian.

1. Genes. 4.24 (Lesmüller-Werner & Thurn 76.64–6): ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ Φιλίππου καὶ 'Αλεξάνδρου τῶν ἀρίστων ἡγεμόνων ἐξείχετο. ὃς Μακεδόνων τῆς γῆς ἐκφυεὶς γεννητόρων ἦν κατὰ γενεὰν οὐκ ἀσήμων.

Dion C. Smythe

Macedonians in eleventh- and twelfth-century Byzantine historiography

This paper is not an attempt to discuss the history of Byzantine Macedonia; other papers in this volume attempt that task. Here I look at the ways in which the term 'Macedonian' and 'Macedonia' were used in Byzantine Greek histories from Psellos to Choniates to see what sense can be made of that usage and what conclusions, if any, can be drawn from that usage.

This paper will not attempt to construct 'Macedonian' as an ethnic or racial category. Such classifications have a place in historical analysis, but their use requires due care and attention. The problem with race as a category of historical analysis is that it is both a folk concept and an analytical concept.[1] Thus as well as having clear definitions — for example that racial difference is one based in physical anthropology, whether by phenotype, by genotype or by clines in Mendelian populations,[2] whilst ethnic groups are ones which may or may not have some basis in physical anthropology to which cultural difference is added[3] — notions of race and ethnicity are also popular and loose, so that people firmly believe they know what they mean when they speak of certain ethnic groups and are equally convinced that they could allocate individuals to such groups on sight. This dual nature of the concepts of race and ethnicity (coupled with the tendency for statements formulated in the analytic mode to degenerate into the folk mode) has made historians rightly wary of using them. If we are to talk meaningfully about 'Macedonians' we must be clear about whom we mean. In this paper, when I speak of 'Macedonians' I am not referring to a distinctive human population united by phenotype, genotype or cline, nor to a population putatively united by language, history, culture or habitation, which I distinguish by this particular label; rather, 'Macedonians' are those individuals referred to as 'Macedonians' in the sources under discussion.

---

1. Michael Banton, "Analytical and folk concepts of race and ethnicity" *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 2 (1979) 127; Pierre van den Berghe, *Race and Racism: A Comparative Perspective* (New York 1967) 9.
2. The phenotype is an organism's actual visible or measurable appearance with respect to a trait or traits. This is contrasted with the genotype which is the underlying genetic constitution of the organism with respect to a particular trait or traits: Michael Banton & Jonathan Harwood, *The Race Concept* (Newton Abbot and London 1975) 48–9; clines are biological gradients of phenotype or genotype differentiation in space which vary discordantly: Julian S. Huxley, "Clines: An Auxiliary Taxonomic Principle" *Nature* 142 (1938) 219–20; Banton & Harwood, *The Race Concept* 57–58; Brewton Berry & Henry L. Tischler, *Race and Ethnic Relations* (4th. ed., Boston 1978) 34–5; Alice Littlefield, Leonard Lieberman & Larry T. Reynolds, "Redefining Race: The Potential Demise of a Concept in Physical Anthropology" *Current Anthropology* 23 (1982) 641–7.
3. van den Berghe, *Race and Racism* 9–10; Banton, "Analytical and folk concepts" 136; Berry & Tischler, *Race and Ethnic Relations* 4, 41.

Byzantine Macedonia. Identity Image and History. Edited by John Burke & Roger Scott (*Byzantina Australiensia* 13, Melbourne 2000).

This paper had its genesis in my own personal research on Byzantine outsiders, which looked at how the Byzantine cultural elite differentiated themselves from the Other, analyzed in terms of religion, gender, race and class (τάξις). When I wrote up my doctoral thesis,[1] I was intrigued by the way in which the term 'Macedonian' was used as a description in the Byzantine histories of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Now working for the Prosopography of the Byzantine Empire (PBE), a major research project of the British Academy based at King's College, London, I thought that this would be a good preliminary test of its utility as a research tool, and so I conducted a search on 'Macedonian' in the ethnic-identity field. The result came back with frightening rapidity, with only one record in the database matching the original query.[2] I knew that more Macedonians were mentioned in the sources already entered into IIIPBE (the part of the database that deals with the period from 1025 to 1261), so why did they not appear in the database? This merited a return to the texts to find the cause, which soon became apparent: the prosopography deals only with individuals; the term 'Macedonians' usually appears as a group description.

The infamous description of how the 'Macedonians' appeared to Michael Psellos is found in his *Chronographia*:

> Most of the Macedonians (Μακεδόνων), being a folk who delight in arrogance and insolent bearing, more accustomed to the buffoonery of the townsmen than the simplicity of the camp, most of them, I say, dismounted from their horses and started choral dances, where everyone could see them. They improvised comic turns at the emperor's expense, stamping on the ground with their feet in time to their music and dancing in triumph.[3]

This description occurs in the account of Constantine IX's opposition to Leo Tornikios's rebellion in 1047. Constantine IX Monomachos's ill-heath had reduced his sphere of action to remaining within the city walls of Constantinople, where he hoped that his status as the true βασιλεὺς καὶ αὐτοκράτωρ τῶν Ῥωμαίων and vice-gerent of God would be sufficient to sustain his rule.[4] When the rebel forces of Leo Tornikios had reached the walls of the City, Constantine IX's first priority had been to show himself to them from the walls, indicating that he was still alive and that there was indeed an emperor within the reigning city, as his death had been one of the justifications for placing Leo Tornikios on the throne.[5] At first the rebels had appealed to the inhabitants of the city, calling on the citizens of Constantinople to accept Leo Tornikios as their new emperor.[6] When the

1. Dion C. Smythe, *Byzantine Perceptions of the Outsider in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries: A Method* (PhD thesis, University of St Andrews 1992).
2. Petros 5001 in IIIPBE, see infra for source citations.
3. Psellos, *Chron.* 6.110 (Renauld II 22 lines 10–16, Sewter 213).
4. Psellos, *Chron.* 6.106 (Renauld II 19).
5. Psellos, *Chron.* 6.109 (Renauld II 21 lines 1–7).
6. Psellos, *Chron.* 6.109 (Renauld II 21 lines 7–15).

citizens of the reigning city failed to follow their lead, then the Macedonians among the rebels dismounted and began their dance.

Constantine IX had been portrayed as the embodiment of imperial στάσις, even though this stability was weakened in part as a virtue because it was due in part to his illness and physical weakness.[1] Though usually imperial στάσις would be presented as a virtue, Psellos portrays it as the object of scorn and ridicule for these Macedonians, given its origins in Constantine IX's sickness and inactivity. As well as being rebels without the proper respect for the imperial dignity, to Psellos they were also "more accustomed to the buffoonery of the townsmen than the simplicity of the camp".[2] Living in Adrianople, the city of the Macedonians, rather than in the God-guarded Queen of Cities they had become weakened and corrupted away from the simple military life (the image of Psellos extolling the simple life away from the city is amusing, given his own experience of monastic exile from the capital). Though they pretended to be soldiers, and had stood drawn up in due order, they were not disciplined but acted on their own, and made spectacles of themselves in public.

The failure of PBE to identify Leo Tornikios, the leader of the rebellion in 1047 whose seige of Constantinople had led to the Macedonian dancing, as a Macedonian is a little more difficult to understand. Leo was a second cousin on the maternal side[3] of Constantine IX and, as a member of the Tornikios family, had connections to Armenia. However he lived in Adrianople and bellowed Macedonian boasting.[4] He was not bad to look at but his habits were shady and his mind was always turned to insurrection[5] a Byzantine *topos* of the Macedonian. Before he came to man's estate a brilliant future was predicted for him, and when he did grow to manhood and began to show some constancy, he became the centre for the Macedonian party.[6] Having mentioned the term 'Macedonian', Psellos immediately introduces the idea of rebellion, saying that these people had tried rebellion many times but always failed. However they nurtured the idea of tyranny (i.e. rebellion) deep in their spirits.[7]

The events involving Leo Tornikios become more complicated when he became the client of Euprepia, sister of Constantine IX, not least because it annoyed her brother the emperor so much.[8] Though placed in honourable exile in Iberia, Euprepia's patronage made Leo Tornikios a threat which Constantine IX attempted to nullify by forcing him into holy orders.[9] On Leo Tornikios's return to

1. Psellos, *Chron.* 6.106 (Renauld II 19 lines 5–8).
2. Psellos, *Chron.* 6.110 (Renauld II 22 lines 11–12).
3. "ἐξανέψιός τις ἐκ μητρικῆς" (Psellos, *Chron.* 6.99, Renauld II 14 lines 1–2).
4. "καὶ Μακεδονικὴν ἐρυγγάνων μεγαλαυχίαν" (Psellos, *Chron.* 6.99, Renauld II 4 lines 4–5).
5. Psellos, *Chron.* 6.99 (Renauld II 14 lines 5–7).
6. "ἡ Μακεδονικὴ μερὶς" (Psellos, *Chron.* 6.99, Renauld II 14 lines 10–11).
7. Psellos, *Chron.* 6.99 (Renauld II 4 lines 11–18).
8. Psellos, *Chron.* 6.100 (Renauld II 15).
9. Psellos, *Chron.* 6.101 (Renauld II 16 lines 11–13).

Constantinople in a monk's habit, however, the Macedonian colony, composed mainly of people from Adrianople, described as:

> crafty individuals, saying one thing and meaning another, only too willing to take up any ridiculous project and most energetic in carrying it out, very clever at hiding their thoughts and absolutely loyal to the agreements they made among themselves[1]

approached Leo Tornikios, and he agreed to join their rebellion. On their part, the Macedonians felt that this was the pretext that they had been waiting for, and the rebellion began, with Leo spirited away to Adrianople. When that city was taken as their headquarters, they raised the standard of their rebellion.[2]

PBE fails to record Leo Tornikios as a Macedonian because, though he associated with Macedonians and with many Macedonian attributes, the source never explicitly describes him as a Macedonian, describing him only as "Leo from Macedonia".[3]

Attaleiates's account of the rebellion of Leo Tornikios is remarkably similar to the one presented by Psellos. He is described as a relative of the emperor Constantine Monomachos, named Leo, who came originally from Adrianople. This Leo had commanded troops at Melitene, and these troops from Macedonia had revolted in his name, even though he was not present. Attaleiates continues that Leo left the capital in secret using the imperial relays to have always a fresh mount. When he came to Adrianople, he assembled all those of military age in the western provinces and within two or three days had amassed a huge army. Attaleiates also records the actions of some insolent and impudent men who hurled base insults in the face of the true emperor, but does not identify them specifically as "Macedonian".[4]

In the account by Zonaras, Leo is again identified as having connections to Adrianople, though on this occasion under its more classical name of Orestias; the people there, identified as Macedonians, were devoted to him as their lord.[5] The Macedonians took Leo from the imperial city and brought him, in whom they had vested their hopes, to their capital Adrianople.[6] Zonaras, like Psellos, describes some of Leo's followers as Macedonians who, when they saw the emperor, because they were used to fooling around, made up songs, danced and stamped the ground with their feet.[7]

The next individual "Macedonian" is the one from Anna Komnene's *Alexiad*, recorded in IIIPBE. He is Petros 5001 Tornikios, who participated in the night ambush of Basilakios by Alexios I Komnenos near the Vardar river, during which

1. Psellos, *Chron.* 6.102 (Renauld II 16 lines 1–7, trans. Sewter 207–8.)
2. Psellos, *Chron.* 6.102 (Renauld II 16–17 lines 10–23).
3. "τὸν ἐκ Μακεδονίας ... Λέοντα" (Psellos, *Chron.* 6.103, Renauld II 17 lines 8–9).
4. Attal. 12. I suggest that this failure to identify the dancers from Adrianople as Macedonians may be due to Attaleiates's own origin in Rhaidestos, which he distinguishes because of its loyalty "from all the towns of Macedonia" (Attal. 14).
5. Zon. III 625.
6. Zon. III 626.
7. Zon. III 628.

engagement he killed many opponents. This seems to have little role to play in the development of the work as a literary narrative, and indeed provides us with little information about Petros 5001 Tornikios apart from his derring-do attack on the enemy's front line:

> Another man, a Macedonian called Petros, with the surname Tornikios,
> fell upon the enemy's centre and slaughtered many.[1]

This same information is reported in Bryennios's *Historical Material*[2] and Anna Komnene's account may derive from there.

Nikephoros Bryennios, the rebel against Nikephoros Botaneiates, is introduced by Zonaras as army commander of the Macedonian troops when he was placed in charge of Cappadocia,[3] and his brother's intervention with the Macedonians prevented others from being captured.[4] Attaleiates's discussion of Nikephoros Bryennios is in the same vein, but is more coherent, describing him as one of the leaders of the plot, named Bryennios, from Adrianople, strategos of the Cappadocians, who having bested the envoy sent by the emperor placed him in irons.[5]

In Niketas Choniates's *Narrative* the Macedonian appears at the beginning of the work, when Niketas Choniates puts words into the mouth of Alexios I Komnenos on his death bed in 1118, when he rejects strongly the advice of his wife Eirene that Nikephoros Bryennios, the husband of Alexios I's daughter Anna Komnene, "the Macedonian", should succeed in preference to John II Komnenos.[6]

Geographical

One of the most frustrating aspects of the use of terms cognate with 'Macedonian' is the geographical description 'Macedonia'. As Professor Koder shows in his paper, there is a disparity in the location of Byzantine Macedonia and the areas usually included in the designation 'Macedonia' today. For the Byzantines, as we have seen, Adrianople and Rhaidestos were cities in Macedonia; since the Byzantine period, 'Macedonia' has experienced a *Drang nach Westen*, and it is centred more on Thessaloniki.

Attaleiates, though it should be stressed that he is to a certain extent a biased source in this regard, notes that Rhaidestos is the only one of all the towns of Macedonia which did not embrace the rebellion of Leo Tornikios against the emperor Constantine IX Monomachos.[7] The second reference to 'Macedonia' in Attaleiates is suitably vague, allowing the imposition of almost any geographical location: the eunuch in command of the Byzantine forces in Bulgaria sent to deal

---

1. An.Komn. 1.8.5 (Leib & Gautier I 33, Sewter 50).
2. Bryen. 4.24 (Gautier 291–3).
3. Zon. III 657.
4. Zon. III 717.
5. Attal. 34.
6. Nik.Chon. 6.21–2
7. Attal. 14; this should be compared with Bryennios's description of Thessaloniki as the metropolis of the Thessalians: Bryen. 4.16 (Gautier 283).

with the rebellion of Leo Tornikios, crossed the mountains that stretch between Macedonia and the Danubian regions, and then spent a day in Grand Presthlava.[1] This appears to place 'Macedonia' in the eastern part of the Balkan peninsula, a suspicion confirmed by Bryennios in his *Historical Material*, who describes the course of one of Alexios I Komnenos's campaigns from Constantinople as follows: "The Komnenos passed through Macedonia and Voleron and reached the Strymon (river)" and then moved on to Strumica.[2] From this, therefore, 'Macedonia' is east of the Strymon river. However, in contrast to this, Eustathios in his account of the capture of Thessaloniki by the Normans in 1185, describes the rapidity with which the Normans captured and then proceded to advance unhindered from Dyrrachion into "our own Macedonia",[3] which implies that for Eustathios 'Macedonia' lay to the west of Thessaloniki, between that city and Dyrrachion.

Another way in which the term 'Macedonia' is used in the histories of the eleventh and twelfth centuries is in the listing of territories, which does little to locate 'Macedonia' in space, but does much to place it in the conceptual world of the Byzantines.

Largely, this is tied in with invasions. Thus Attaleiates records that the Scyths having been emboldened by their previous successes invaded Macedonia, which they completely ravaged, taking great riches in new trophies to their tents near Adrianople (so Macedonia is again in the eastern part of the Balkans).[4] In Zonaras's accounts the use of the term 'Macedonia' is more complex. When Samuel the leader of the Bulgarians was plundering not only Thrace and Macedonia but also Hellas, even down as far as the Peloponnese, the emperor Nikephoros III Botaneiates appointed Uranos as the supreme commander in the West.[5] In effect, this is a way of stressing the serious situation in which the emperor found himself and the empire, by enumerating all the provinces that were devastated. Similarly he records that the Patzinak incursions rendered all Thrace and Macedonia dangerous, a situation remedied only by the conclusion of a 30 year peace between the Byzantines under Botaneiates and the Patzinaks.[6] This use of the combination of 'Macedonia' and other regions' names to emphasize the extent of the devastation is a feature repeated in Zonaras: under Constantine X Doukas the Uzes plundered Macedonia, reaching as far as Hellas;[7] under the same emperor the Patzinaks plundered the land of the Thracians and the Macedonians and the region of the Bulgarians;[8] and again with the Patzinak incursions under Alexios I Komnenos, who are described as leaving their homeland, entering Roman territory and plundering all Thrace and Macedonia.[9]

---

1. Attal. 22.
2. Bryen. 4.18 (Gautier 285).
3. Eust. Thess., *Capture* 66.5.
4. Attal. 18.
5. Zon. III 558.
6. Zon. III 644.
7. Zon. III 678.
8. Zon. III 713–4.
9. Zon. III 740.

The sole mention of 'Macedonia' in Kinnamos is during his account of John II Komnenos's response to the Patzinak incursion across the Danube in 1121. He simply states that the emperor, after a short stay in the capital, set out for Macedonia in response to the invasion, without specifying the location.

In Bryennios's *Historical Material*, the extent of the incursions by the Scyths is stressed by the fact that they emcompassed Thrace and Macedonia, "so that one might say that all Europe and almost all Asia was threatened by these two enemies".[1] In the same way, Bryennios records that Michael VII had to struggle against numerous dangers: Scyths ravaging Thrace and Macedonia, and the Slavs who, having thrown off the yoke of the Romans, were pillaging and laving waste the land of the Bulgarians.[2]

Anna Komnene's *Alexiad* refers to Macedonia in the context of the Patzinak war in 1087, when the Scyths were said to have been expelled from Macedonia and Philippoupolis and to have returned back across the Danube.[3]

Choniates's *Narrative* deals with Patzinak incursions into Thrace, and recalls the Patzinak invasions of Thrace and Macedonia in the reign of Alexios I Komnenos, as indeed does the next incursion, when Ivanko acted as a bulwark round Philippoupolis guarding it against incursions from the Cumans in 1197–1200. In 1197–98 or perhaps in 1199 the Cumans "overran all of Macedonia".[4]

The final two mentions of the Macedonians (in the formula "the Macedonian cities") in Niketas Choniates's *Narrative*, occur in the account of Ioannitsa, where first he incited those going home to revolt against the Latins present in their cities, and then when he laid waste the Macedonian and Thracian towns, which he turned into a desolate wilderness.[5]

Expanding slightly beyond the notion of geographical Macedonia, but connected to it in the use made of the ethnic descriptor to emphasize the all-encompassing nature of the troops, are the instances when "Macedonians" are enumerated in troop musters. This can have a positive or a negative import, as can be seen from Zonaras's description of the capture of Constantinople by the Komnenoi in 1081. In this, Zonaras states that the capturing troops plundered the city and it mattered not whether they were Thracians, Macedonians, other Romans or barbarians, because all behaved in the same way, behaving towards their fellow countrymen no better than enemies.[6]

In a positive vein Bryennios records that John Komnenos the *Kouropalates* left an unforgettable monument to his great deeds among the Thracians, the Macedonians, the Illyrians and the Bulgars, just as much among the leaders of these peoples as among the people themselves.[7] This ennumeration of the people

1. Bryen. 2.3 (Gautier 147).
2. Bryen. 3.1 (Gautier 209–211).
3. An.Komn. 7.1-2 (Leib & Gautier II 87-9).
4. Nik.Chon. 14.47, 473.66, 508.69.
5. Nik.Chon. 613.67–8, 635.18.
6. Zon. III 729.
7. Bryen. 1.3 (Gautier 79).

involved serves to stress the greatness of the *Kouropalates's* honour, stretching out from the Byzantines of the capital. A similar sense of inclusiveness is gained from the description of Nikephoros Bryennios's meeting with his brother John and all the troops the latter had managed to amass: all the regiments of Macedonia and Thrace, together with the commanders and guardsmen.[1] This image is continued when Bryennios speaks of his grandfather, informed of the rebellion, but still resident in Thrace, gathering together all the troops of Macedonia and Thrace, swollen with allied contingents and marching on the capital.[2] The inclusiveness to stress superiority is used again by Bryennios the writer when he describes the rebel as being accompanied by the superior officers, by the leader of the Macedonians, by the generals, the leaders of the battalions and the other officers from Thrace.[3] Again, when drawing up his troops to face Alexios Komnenos, sent by Nikephoros III Botaneiates to defeat the rebel, Bryennios the historian described the second tier as being made up of Macedonian and Thracian squadrons, making up about 3,000 men, whilst in the centre all the members of the great noble families of Thrace, Macedonia and the Thessalian cavalry were gathered together.[4]

In dealing with the same event, Anna Komnene in *The Alexiad* gives such enumerations a different twist, as she mentions "Macedonians" in connection with the troop commanded by Tarchaneiotes Katakalon when Alexios I Komnenos opposed the rebellion led by Nikephoros Bryennios.[5] This forms part of an episcope where the diverse nature of Alexios's troops are registered. By stressing that his troops were garnered from all corners of the empire and indeed beyond, Anna stresses the weakness of her father's position, and by doing so thus makes his victory over Bryennios more impressive.

The similar mention of the "Macedonians" in *The Alexiad* comes when Alexios ordered a muster to face the incursion of Robert Guiscard after the defeat at Dyrrachion in 1081. Pakourianos left Constantinople and secured the region round Adrianople, before moving up to Alexios's position.[6] In an enumeration of the troop units, the Macedonians are said to be commanded by Antiochos, and given the accompanying references to Thessalians and Turks from the district of Achrida, this appears to combine a reference to people who came from Adrianople with the notion that Alexios's survival was all the more remarkable because of the weakness of the position he was in when he started.[7]

A mention of "Macedonians" in connection with other groups within the empire is used in a positive light again, when Niketas Choniates, in his *Narrative*, records how, when Constantinople had fallen and the Empire was being divided up, Manuel Angelos was taken in procession and presented as the new emperor, and

1. Bryen. 3.8 (Gautier 227).
2. Bryen. 4.2 (Gautier 259).
3. Bryen. 4.2 (Gautier 261).
4. Bryen. 4.4 (Gautier 269).
5. An.Komn. 1.5.1ff (Leib & Gautier I 20ff).
6. An.Komn. 4.4.1 (Leib & Gautier I 150).
7. An.Komn. 4.4.3 (Leib & Gautier I 152).

Niketas Choniates records that "he was warmly received by the Macedonians, the Thessalians and all the lands reaching down to Hellas".[1] Here the Macedonians serve as a reminder of the universality of the empire, together with the Thessalians and the lands of Greece.

At this point, with Macedonia associated with "the lands of Greece" but separate from it, I wish to impose some order on the plethora of instances of Macedonia and Macedonians I have garnered from the sources. Firstly it should be stressed that these investigations are not complete, as they do not include all thirteen of the Byzantine histories of the period. However, bearing that in mind, the sources discussed here provide a representative sample. Broadly the use of the terms 'Macedonian' and 'Macedonia' in the Byzantine histories of the eleventh and twelfth centuries falls into one of two categories. The first of these categories — the geographical — is, on the surface, more straight forward. People and places are described as being 'Macedonian' on account of their location. The slight problem with this category is that the location of this Byzantine Macedonia is not the same as the Balkan areas currently referred to as Macedonia. On the one hand, this should come as no surprise as history deals with change through time; on the other hand, however, we are largely prisoners of the Byzantine trap, believing them when they repeat their self-evident truth that Byzantium is unchanging unto the ages of ages. A further Byzantine axiom is the slow-changing nature of the language. In comparison with English, Greek has changed remarkably little from the twelfth century, but that is not to say that it has not changed at all, and it is definitely not to say that the signifiers still signify the same signified. The sign 'Macedonia' is an example that clearly they do not.

The second aspect of the usage of Macedonian and Macedonia in eleventh- and twelfth-century Byzantine histories is double-sided. They are labels used to differentiate people, places and things. In common with many social differentiations, the use of these words to label may represent a degree of prejudice, a negative separation out and down. However, differentiation is not innately negative. In its positive guise, the use of Macedonian or Macedonia as a label, usually as part of a list or enumeration of such labels, serves to stress the ecumenical nature of the Byzantine Empire. Just as the Macedonian element contributes to the triumph of the Byzantine emperor over the barbarians, so too the Thessalian; just as in Macedonia, so too in Greece. I should be pleased to be able to assert that this was the dominant usage in these middle Byzantine histories; unfortunately, just as in other times and places "separate but equal" has proven to be "separate and unequal", so too in Byzantium, at least as refracted through the sources composed by members of the elite, "different and Macedonian" frequently has carried connotations of "rebellious" and "not us". The clinching argument in support of this seems to be Michael Attaleiates's lack of "Macedonian pride". By this I do not mean that his writings fail to display love of homeland, for they do. What is lacking is the assertion of pride in being Macedonian, taking on a label

1. Nik.Chon. 601.67–70.

with negative associations and asserting its positive nature in the face of a hostile dominant elite.

The way in which these two usages of 'Macedonian' — the geographical and the differential — are connected is that both are social constructions, where their various meanings are given form and invested with meaning by the people who used them. Critics of such formulations accuse writers of excessive relativism, disassociating concepts from any absolute meaning. 'Macedonian' has no absolute meaning. It had a range of meanings for the Byzantines in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and with careful reading and understanding of the sources we, in the twentieth century, can recover some of those meanings. However, on the streets of Thessaloniki and Melbourne and in the corridors of power in Athens, 'Macedonian' has a different range of meanings; some may overlap with some Byzantine meanings, but there are two separate ranges. It is profitable and enjoyable to compare those different ranges, but for scholars of the past it is imperative to remember that what was true then, is not necessarily true now: "the past is a foreign country; they do things differently there".

Apostolos Karpozilos

Macedonia as reflected in the epistolography of the fourteenth century

Byzantine letters seldom touch upon political issues, tending instead by their very nature to discuss literary topics and personal matters. This does not necessarily imply that political affairs as they affected everyday routine were entirely shunned by letter writers — consider, for instance, the letters of Libanius, Leo Choirosphaktes or Nicholas Mystikos, to mention just a few. The present discussion is concerned with the kind of facts reported about Macedonia by letter writers of the Palaiologan period, and specifically those of the 14th century. With the loss of the greater part of Asia Minor to the Turks, the Greek provinces in the Balkan peninsula — Thrace and Macedonia — became of vital importance to the survival of the declining Empire and henceforth they figure prominently in the sources of the period. The value of epistles as historical sources lies, I think, mainly in the fact that they either supplement historical sources or provide first-hand information which, more often than not, is the only information available on certain events. In the letters of this period, for instance, the authors describe the situation prevailing in the provinces of Macedonia and Thrace or express their fears and anxieties in the face of imminent dangers.[1] Certainly, the authors belonged to an intellectual elite, and consequently their point of view may or may not have been accurate, objective or correct. But this is beside the point; what matters is that they were not blind to reality.[2]

One of the main points the authors make is that the countryside in Thrace and Macedonia was not entirely under government control. After the Catalan inroads in these areas, which left behind desolation and much destruction, the provinces were ravaged by bands of robbers and by roaming Turks. With the permanent settlement of the latter on the European side, even the fortified cities were not safe. The socio-political upheavals, civil strife and the ensuing uprisings made matters worse. So when Oinaiotes wrote about the dangers he had encountered while travelling on horseback from Rhaidestos to Ganos (a relatively short distance from Constantinople) in the years between 1326 and 1330, he was not exaggerating. For one thing, the main country roads were not safe for travellers any more. On his way to Ganos he saw the desolation and utter destruction wrought by raiding Turkish bands which did not spare churches, monasteries, water fountains and springs or any other similar amenities which provided travellers with a place to rest: χώρας ἀοίκους κεκαυμένας ὑπὸ τῶν ἐχθίστων βαρβάρων, ναοὺς ἀναστάτους,

1. See, for instance, A. Karpozilos, "Ταξιδιωτικές επιστολές και εντυπώσεις σε επιστολογραφικά κείμενα" *Η Επικοινωνία στο Βυζάντιο* (Athens 1993) 511–41.
2. Cf. I. Ševčenko, "The Decline of Byzantium Seen through the Eyes of its Intellectuals" *DOP* 15 (1961) 169–86.

Byzantine Macedonia. Identity Image and History. Edited by John Burke & Roger Scott (*Byzantina Australiensia* 13, Melbourne 2000).

εἰκόνας καταπεπατημένας, θυσιαστήρια μεμιασμένα ...[1] This picture of the misery which plagued the countryside in the wider area of Thrace is drawn also by two other authors writing in the same period, Demetrios Kydones (1346) and Matthaios Gabalas (1332). To reach the poverty-stricken town of Brysis, which was to become his episcopal see, Gabalas had first to elude a band of robbers lying in wait for passing caravans in a place called Santa Maria.[2] For his part, Kydones does not disclose the name of the village where he spent New Year's Day in 1346. The poverty he saw in that place depressed him so much that he put his feelings in writing and philosophised about human misery.[3] But for that matter life was not much better in Brysis either, which excelled only in bad climate, a high mortality rate, insects, thieves and drunks, as Gabalas candidly writes. The place was crowded with refugees who came from the surrounding area fleeing before foreign invaders — women, men and children together with their domestic animals: γύναια σὺν ἀνδράσι καὶ παιδάρια καὶ βοῦν καὶ ἵππον καὶ κύνα καὶ ὗν.[4]

The devastation of Thrace was not confined to the two areas described by Oinaiotes and Gabalas. Nikephoros Gregoras also writes about the devastation of the land in a letter in which he describes a journey he made in 1326 to the Kral of Serbia to negotiate the return from Skopje of Eirene, the daughter of Theodore Metochites.[5] His caravan travelled overland through Thrace and Macedonia. But in Thrace, Gregoras remarks, they could not find a proper place to spend the night because the inhabitants had deserted their homes to seek refuge in fortresses because of rumours of an imminent Mongolian invasion.[6] Implied here are the Mongolian invasions that laid waste to the Balkans in the years 1320, 1321 and 1323/4. Unfortunately Gregoras does not elaborate any further about his trip from the Queen city to Amphipolis, thinking that his addressee knew what was happening on that stretch.[7] Fortunately, he expands more on his travelling experiences after arriving in Amphipolis by describing those incidents which he considered to be of interest to his addressee because they took place in unfamiliar territory, τά γε μὴν ἐπέκεινα [τοῦ Στρυμόνος] — like the crossing of the Strymon in the spring which, as it happened, was not an easy venture because of the melting snow and the strong currents. About seventy men travelling in his group had to cross the river with the

1. Ep. 157, *Cod. Laur. S. Marci 356*, fol. 243r. For the correspondence of Oinaiotes see also E. Rein, *Die Florentiner Briefsammlung Codex Laurentianus S. Marco 356* (Helsinki 1915) 30–2; G. Fatouros, "Aus der Briefsammlung des Anonymous Florentinus (Georgios? Oinaiotes)" *JÖB* 22 (1973) 208.
2. Kourouses I 346–7.
3. Ep. 5; R.J. Loenertz, *Démétrius Cydonès Correspondance* (*ST* 186, Vatican City 1956) 26–31.
4. D. Reinsch, *Die Briefe des Matthaios von Ephesos im Codex Vindobonensis Theol. Gr. 174* (Berlin 1974) 201, 350.
5. On Gregoras' mission see Greg., ed. van Dieten II.1 (178–83).
6. Greg. 8.14 (Schopen & Bekker 375.3).
7. Nikephoros Gregoras Epistle 32a, *Nicephori Gregorae Epistulae* ed. P. Leone (Matino 1982) II 104 lines 27–31. The same letter was addressed separately to Andronikos Zarides and to a certain Athanasios, and its narrative section was incorporated into the *Ῥωμαϊκὴ Ἱστορία*.

added encumbrance of twice as many or more pack animals. Gregoras does not describe the exact point where the crossing was made. However, they used a single small boat (ἀκάτιον) and crossed one by one, or sometimes two or three together, with their animals.[1] After they had spent the greater part of the day traversing the river they started to look for a place to spend the night, but they were unable to find one because the area was deserted on account of roaming bands of brigands: ἔφοδοι γάρ τινες λῃστρικαὶ συνεχείᾳ χρησάμεναι πρὸ μικροῦ τάχιστα τὸν τόπον ἔρημον ἐκεῖνον καὶ ἀτριβῆ πεποιήκεσαν.[2] So in the dark of a moonless night they began to wander about not knowing exactly where they were heading. What follows next in the letter is a rare travel description that rivals the best of its kind despite the archaisms in the language and the artificial style. They made their way north, travelling in the darkness through narrow passes and cutting through thick undergrowth, exhausted and frightened by the thought that they could be attacked at any moment by brigands. But some of the men in the caravan were oblivious to the dangers and began to sing, and the echo of their songs was carried some distance through the mountains and canyons. They sang about the deeds of heroic men, continues Gregoras, "of whose fame we hear but a rumour and know not anything about them."[3] The same night they fell in with a band of armed men who patrolled the roads looking for bandits. They wore black dresses made of goat or sheep skin and spoke a foreign tongue, observed Gregoras, for they were Mysian settlers, most of whom had established themselves long ago and made their living with us: Μυσῶν γὰρ ἄποικοι τῶν ἐκεῖσε προσοικούντων εἰσὶν ἀρχῆθεν οἱ πλείους καὶ τοῖς ἡμῖν ὁμοφύλοις ἀναμὶξ τὴν δίαιταν ἔχοντες.[4] But exactly who were these 'Mysian colonists' — Slavs or Bulgars? I suggest the latter. In the theme of Strymon and further up in the north, in the region of Stromnitsa, there had long since been established communities of foreign peasants, though in what numbers it is not easy to determine.[5] Be that as it may, the band of armed Mysians which Gregoras encountered was patrolling the roads and thus rendering a service to the Empire.

The place where Gregoras and his group spent the night is not specified, for obviously its name did not mean anything to him. This time, however, they found accommodation so they hastily dispersed here and there to their lodgings. Next day, after a full day's journey, they arrived in a small town called by the locals Stromnitsa — the ancient Tiberioupolis — situated on an exceedingly steep mountain (πολίχνιον, ὡς εἰπεῖν ὑπερνέφελον). To Gregoras' great disappointment it was there that they had to celebrate Easter Sunday, which fell on 23 March 1326. But as the historian observes, they did not celebrate Easter according to custom and tradition because 'culture', i.e. paideia and the sacred

1. Ibid. 106 lines 60–1.
2. Ibid. 106 lines 80–2.
3. Ibid. 107 lines 105–110.
4. Ibid. 108 lines 126–8.
5. A. Laiou-Thomadakis, *Ἡ ἀγροτικὴ κοινωνία στὴν ὕστερη βυζαντινὴ ἐποχή* (Athens 1987) 180–1.

hymns, meant nothing to the inhabitants there who toiled with the spade.[1] To Gregoras their singing was not even half barbarian, nor had it any rhythm but sounded animal-like or rather like the song of nomads and mountaineers (οὐ γὰρ μιξοβάρβαρον μέν, εὔρυθμον δὲ τὸν ἦχον προὔφερον, ἀλλ' ὅσον βοσκηματώδη καὶ ὄρειον).[2] In Stromnitsa they spent the day of Easter resting from their travels, giving Gregoras the opportunity to watch the *panegyris* and dances in the fields from the walls of the fortress.

They reached their final destination after a three-day journey from Stromnitsa. Gregoras was not at all impressed by the sights of Skopje, which he describes as a πολίχνιον ἐν ὅροις τῶν Τριβαλλῶν ('within the boundaries of the Triballoi'), so he does not have anything specific to report about it. The only interesting sight he found there was the river Axios, which impressed him with its strong currents.[3] The Axios, he observes, was far bigger than the Strymon; as it flowed downstream it changed its name to Vardar. It is worth noting that in his opinion the name Vardar was applied to the river in its lower reaches: ἀλλ' οὖν ἐς τὸ κάταντες ἰὼν καὶ ἄλλοις χειμάρροις τὸ ῥεῦμα κοινούμενος καὶ ἐς Βαρδάριον μετιθέμενος τοὔνομα.[4]

I hope that it has become evident by now that Gregoras emphasises mostly the obstacles and dangers he encountered on his journey. The main theme that runs throughout his letter is the risks and adventures that were in store for him when he ventured outside the walls of the Capital. The devastation that Gregoras observed in the Macedonian countryside in 1326 is mentioned only in passing in his letter and is incidental to his search for lodgings to spend the night. The situation prevailing in the countryside, whether in Thrace or Macedonia, provided the canvas for his story.

Yet however elliptical or fragmentary they may appear, reports like that of Gregoras prove invaluable when they are combined with other sources which deal with the same subject. Thomas Magistros, writing to Joseph the Philosopher about the evils of the Catalan and Turkish attacks in the early years of the 14th century (Περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰταλῶν καὶ Περσῶν ἐφόδῳ γεγενημένων), reports that nothing was left standing after the enemy raids they had suffered.[5] The destruction was universal and even Athos was not spared.[6] Surprisingly, Magistros does not mention any organised armed resistance against the enemy, which perhaps implies the total absence of defence forces. The Turks moved about unhindered, killing and looting, leaving nothing untouched: οὐδὲν γοῦν ἐῶσιν ἀπείρατον τῆς ἐπιδρομῆς ... ἐλαύνοντες πάντα κατάκρας τὸν τῇδε χῶρον, οὐκ ὄρος, οὐ πεδίον, οὐ φάραγγας, οὐ κρημνοὺς πάντα οἴχεται ..., πάντα ἐλήλαται,

1. Ep. 32a (Leone 109 line 158–110 line 162).
2. Ibid. 110 lines 162–4.
3. Ibid. 110 line 180–111 line 186.
4. Ibid. 110 line 183–111 line 185.
5. J Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca* II (Paris 1830) 212–28; PG 145 432–45.
6. PG 145 441D.

πάντα μεστὰ νεκρῶν καὶ πτωμάτων καὶ φόνου μυρίου.[1] Those who escaped the bloodshed at the hand of the enemy became themselves robbers who looted their own brethren. The chaos prevailing in the countryside now threatened the city of Thessaloniki. For up to that point the cities had been left alone, but now the enemy made pressing demands, threatening them with war and annihilation. Unable to confront the invaders, the Thessalonians followed events helplessly. The situation called for action, concluded Thomas Magistros, but they needed money, courage and an army.[2]

The situation became still worse within a decade since, in addition to the enemy attacks, there was now widespread civil strife and uprisings which caused great harm to the Macedonian cities and the countryside. Thessaloniki became a stronghold for the followers of young Andronikos III who revolted against the aged Andronikos II.[3] The atmosphere of the uprising in the Macedonian capital is described by Magistros in a letter to Theodore Metochites, the trusted friend and advisor of the aged emperor. The letter is dated between 1322 and 1324.[4] Magistros likened the uprising to an evil demon that had suddenly taken hold of their city, turning law and order, century-old traditions and moral conduct upside down. The citizens had been divided into warring factions clashing against each other at night, breaking into houses, looting and killing. Thessaloniki had become an example for other Macedonian cities like Serres and Potidaia which followed suit in this insanity: Σεραῖοι γοῦν καὶ Ποτιδαιᾶται, καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ πόλεις, οὐδ' ἔστιν εἰπεῖν ἐς ὅσον μανίας ἤλασαν ...[5] As Magistros did not look into the problems that caused the civil strife and the uprisings, he does not offer explanations such as the flight of the peasantry into the cities and the formation of a new under-class.

The letters we have examined do not go into further detail about life in towns and the countryside as these remarks are purely incidental to their main narrative. Some letters, though written in the midst of serious events, do not refer to them even incidentally. Consider, for instance, the correspondence of Isidore, Metropolitan of Thessaloniki, which is almost completely devoid of reference to historical events. Isidore wrote once to Matthaios Phakrases, Metropolitan of Serres, who had been taken prisoner by the Turks after the capture of the city in 1389, but his letter does not disclose anything important — perhaps in order not to implicate his addressee in captivity.[6] Be that as it may, the only example from epistolography that I know of which mentions life under the Turks in Macedonia is in a letter of Ioannes Chortasmenos addressed to the protonotarios of Veroia, the

1. Ibid. 440A.
2. Ibid. 445A–C.
3. K. Kyrris, *Τὸ Βυζάντιον κατὰ τὸν ΙΔ΄ αἰῶνα: Ἡ πρώτη φάσις τοῦ ἐμφυλίου πολέμου καὶ ἡ πρώτη συνδιαλλαγὴ τῶν δύο Ἀνδρονίκων (20 IV – Φθινόπωρον 1321)* (Nicosia 1982) 50–1.
4. PG 145 404–9; Kyrris, op.cit. 51.
5. PG 145 409C.
6. S. Lambros, "Ἰσιδώρου μητροπολίτου Θεσσαλονίκης ὀκτὼ ἐπιστολαὶ ἀνέκδοτοι" *NE* 9 (1912) 353–8, esp. 352 lines 9–13.

deacon Ioannes Taronas.[1] Writing shortly after the capture of the city in May 1387, Chortasmenos laments the plight of Taronas and his fellow citizens. The tragedy was that Taronas, a man learned in Greek, who could have been in the service of the Emperor, had to suffer slavery and associate daily with peasants. Yet his worst fear, writes Chortasmenos, was that the people in Veroia living under bondage might soon lose their Greek language by speaking barbarian: ὥστε θαυμάζω, εἰ μὴ καιροῦ προϊόντος καὶ τὰ τῆς φωνῆς ὑμῖν ἤδη προσαπολεῖται ἐκ τῆς ἑλληνικῆς εἰς τὴν βάρβαρον τὴν μεταβολὴν ὑπομείναντα.[2] To avert this fear, like many of his contemporaries he turned his thoughts to the glories of ancient Greece, for a new awareness of the Greek past and their Hellenic roots had become a trend by now among the intelligentsia. The circumstances called for a new Themistocles who could display the same bravery and prudence, Chortasmenos concluded. The Turks would then learn which race they were trying to vanquish: ὃ πάντων ἐστι τῶν ὑπ' οὐρανὸν εὐγενέστατον, περὶ οὗ μοι καὶ Ὅμηρος εἰκότως ἂν φαίνοιτο λέγων [*Od.* 1.264] τοῦ δὴ νῦν μέγιστον ὑπουράνιον κλέος ἐστί.[3]

I shall not dwell upon the many important events that took place in the course of the 14th century in Thessaloniki, such as Hesychasm or the Zealot Revolt or the appearance of new trends in classical scholarship as demonstrated in the works of Thessalonian philologists. The letters of Gregory Palamas and his followers on the one hand, and of Demetrios Kydones, Nikephoros Gregoras and Gregorios Akindynos on the other, provide first-hand information on more or less well-known events. To conclude this brief paper, I should like to comment on the letters exchanged between Manuel Palaiologos and Demetrios Kydones during Manuel's brief reign in Thessaloniki from 1382 to 1387.

In November 1382 Manuel Palaiologos proclaimed himself independent ruler of Thessaloniki, determined not to follow a passive policy towards the Turks as his father had done. He embarked on an ambitious campaign to regain lost territories for his realm, which he governed in open defiance of the reigning emperor. His initial actions were crowned with success, as we learn from at least four of Kydones' letters (243, 244, 247, 249).[4] But from November of 1383 the Turks surrounded the city with their armies, cutting it off from sea and land by a blockade which the Thessalonians endured for about four years until April 1387. During this time the citizens of Thessaloniki came into open conflict with Manuel on account of the policy he was following. In the end he was forced by the public outcry to leave the city, accompanied by a small group of followers. The gates of the megalopolis then opened to receive the conqueror.[5]

---

1. Chortasmenos, Ep. 19 (Chortasm. 87–9, 168–70).
2. Ibid. 169 lines 26–8.
3. Ibid. 169 lines 35–7.
4. R.J. Loenertz, *Démétrius Cydonès Correspondance* II (*ST* 208, Vatican city 1960) 146–55.
5. G. Dennis, "The reign of Manuel II Palaeologus in Thessalonica 1382–1387" *OrChrAn* 159 (Rome 1960) 52ff.

The brief reign of Manuel Palaiologos in Thessaloniki is known primarily from the letters he exchanged with Kydones, whose interest in his native city is attested by the number of letters he wrote between 1382 and 1387. From the correspondence of the two men it appears that Manuel supported the idea of a national campaign against the Turks, which from the beginning the majority regarded with scepticism and misgivings, including Manuel's friend, Kydones.[1] However, their opinion changed as the news of his successes reached the City. In his letters, which are dated to the autumn of 1382 or somewhat later,[2] Kydones refers to Manuel's military accomplishments and how he exhorted his soldiers to imitate the example and the virtues of their ancestors. Prisoners were freed, fortresses were taken and cities opened their gates after prolonged sieges.[3] With the siege of the city by the Turks, the situation changed dramatically. Kydones tried to follow the course of events closely, despite the fact that communicating with Manuel had become difficult.[4] With time Manuel's letters became even more rare and Kydones had to ask foreign merchants to carry his letters to his friend.[5] He speaks openly about his fears to his former student Radenos, who had at that time joined Manuel in Thessaloniki.[6]

In the autumn of 1383 Manuel asked the people and the leaders of the city to make greater sacrifices in their struggle for freedom, reminding them of their ancestral values and the long history of Hellenism. His call for greater sacrifice was in answer to those who were ready to negotiate with the Turks and had openly propagated the idea of surrendering the city to them. Manuel maintained that the Thessalonians should instead choose between victory or death. His plea for the continuation of the struggle survives in the form of a discourse he read at a public gathering (Συμβουλευτικὸς λόγος).[7] The same discourse is also mentioned by Kydones, who praises Manuel for finding time in the midst of so many problems to write such a splendid speech to strengthen the morale of his subjects.[8] The hopes of the besieged in the city were not revived, however, and sank even further. After the fall of Serres and the capture of Chortiates in 1383 the situation became desperate. The news of the capture of Serres and Chortiates, Kydones wrote to Radenos, had pierced his heart: μετὰ τὴν τῶν Σερρῶν ἀγγελίαν καὶ ... ὅσα κατὰ τῆς πατρίδος ἐκώμασαν, ἄλλο πικρότερον ἡ τύχη τὸ τοῦ Χορτιάτου πέμψασα βέλος, μέσην ἡμῖν ἔτεμε τὴν καρδίαν.[9] Kydones now pictures Manuel as a captain who steered a sinking ship through reefs while there was no harbour within

1. Ibid. 60.
2. Ep. 243, 244, 247, 249.
3. Ep. 244 (Loenertz II 147 lines 4–9), cf. 247 (151 lines 38–42); Dennis, op.cit. 61–2.
4. Ep. 253, 262, 277, 294, 299.
5. Ep. 277 (Loenertz II 196 lines 13–14).
6. Ep. 248 (Loenertz II 153 lines 30–34).
7. B. Laourdas, "'Ο 'Συμβουλευτικὸς πρὸς τοὺς Θεσσαλονικεῖς' τοῦ Μανουὴλ Παλαιολόγου" *Makedonika* 3 (1953–5) 290–307, ed. 295–302; Dennis, op.cit. 78–85.
8. Ep. 262 (Loenertz II 167 line 30–168 line 33).
9. Ep. 289 (Loenertz II 209 lines 9–12).

view in which to anchor.[1] In another letter to Radenos, Kydones confides that he considers the city of Thessaloniki to be dead by now.[2] Nevertheless he continues to advise Manuel not to give up hope in God for it is not the first time that a city has faced such great danger.[3]

In the critical period between 1384 and 1385 Manuel faced a discontented city in which there was no more strength for resistance. He tried to convince the people to stay and fight the invader (δεῖν τῆς τῆς πατρίδος ἀνέχεσθαι τύχης ... [καὶ] τοὺς πολίτας παραμένειν ταῖς πόλεσι, καὶ μὴ προαφίστασθαι τῶν κινδύνων ...),[4] but his call to arms apparently did not stir many. Actually, from the very start he had found out that it was not easy to establish his rule in a divided city. He writes to Kydones in 1382:

> For it is not possible, I believe it is not possible for anyone to rule over our fellow citizens if their views remain unchanged, unless he should first rain down gold on them as Zeus did for the Rhodians in the myth. They hold such a great swarm of words in reserve that you would not be wrong to call them all Suidases ... Indeed, we need either the wealth of Croesus or an eloquence above average to be able to persuade them to bear poverty in good repute rather than to desire a blameworthy wealth. They have to be convinced, moreover, that it is nobler and far less shameful to suffer willingly the lot of slaves for the sake of their freedom than, after having become slaves in heart, to try to gain the rights of free men.[5]

Kydones also discusses the problem of conflicting interests and ideologies in Thessaloniki in one of his letters to Manuel, written in the winter of 1384, in which he states flatly that they could not expect much from those who preferred enslavement to armed resistance. Some had even maintained that by living under the Turks they could safeguard their faith: Οὕτω πάντες μαίνονται, καὶ πρὸς τὸ τοὺς βαρβάρους ἐφ' ἑαυτοὺς καὶ τὰς πόλεις καλεῖν εἰσιν ἕτοιμοι ... Οἱ δὲ σοφώτεροι τοῦτο μὲν ἀνέδην οὐτωσὶ λέγειν φυλάττονται, ἀσφαλέστερον δὲ τοῖς Τούρκοις συνοικοῦντες ἰσχυρίζονται τὴν πίστιν τηρήσειν.[6] Kydones had even heard that some of the prominent people "do not hesitate to proclaim openly in public that to attempt to free our native land from the Turks is clearly to war against God".[7] Elsewhere Kydones states that he had no illusions about the fate of Thessaloniki and had voiced his pessimism even before the outbreak of this crisis. Thessaloniki and every other city which showed signs of the 'old disease' — by this he refers to the rival political factions that divided the

1. Loenertz II 209 lines 13–16.
2. Ep. 285 (Loenertz II 207 lines 15–18).
3. Ep. 299 (Loenertz II 216 lines 13ff).
4. Ep. 309 (Loenertz II 231 line 21–232 line 24).
5. Ep. 4, G. Dennis, *The Letters of Manuel II Palaeologus. Text, Translation and Notes* (Washington DC 1977) 13 lines 10–14; cf. id., "The reign of Manuel II" 86.
6. Ep. 320 (Loenertz II 249 lines 14–15, 21–23).
7. Ep. 324 lines 39–42 (Loenertz II 254 lines 39–42); Dennis, "The reign of Manuel II" 86.

cities — was doomed because they could not face the enemy when divided by civil strife. He feared more the political dissent among the Greeks than the harm caused by the threat of external danger. After every siege, Kydones observes, there is a popular uprising. Their inability to counter the enemy attacks leads the people to turn against each other. Now he fears lest the Thessalonians vie with the external enemy and while the enemy attack the walls from the outside, those inside slaughter each other: τίς δ' οὐκ οἶδε, τῶν τοιούτων κακῶν τὴν ἡμετέραν πόλιν οὖσαν διδάσκαλον... ; Δέδοικα τοίνυν μὴ σφῶν αὐτῶν ἀναμνησθέντες οἱ Θεσσαλονικεῖς συναγωνίσωνται τοῖς ἐχθροῖς, κἀκείνων τοῖς τείχεσι προσβαλλόντων, οὗτοι σφάττωσιν ἔνδον τοὺς ταῦτα δυναμένους κωλύειν, καὶ πάλιν σπλάγχνων τε γεύσωνται καὶ χωρεύσωσι τὰ τῆς σχετλίας ἡμέρας.[1] In his sermons the metropolitan of the city, Isidore Glabas, also tried to rally his flock behind Manuel, warning them that they ought not to blame Manuel's policy if they should lose hope.[2]

Disappointed by the antagonism of his subjects, Manuel was forced in the end to depart in April 1387, whereupon the city fell to the Turks. The reason why Manuel failed to avert the Turkish menace should not be sought in Turkish military strength but rather, as Kydones suggests, in civil discord and disunity among the inhabitants themselves.[3] With a few followers he found refuge in a small village of Lesbos, where he warred against the stifling heat while within he struggled with his own thoughts. In a letter written in the summer of the same year and sent to his friend Nicholas Chamaetos Kabasilas, he states flatly:

> In your native city, I kept on fighting against the enemies of the faith. But those on whose behalf I chose to face death each day and night ought to have responded in like manner or, at the very least, been grateful because of the dangers I underwent for them; such should have been their intention and purpose. But these same people were fighting along with the enemy, not so much because they neither thought nor did anything noble or sound, but because they gave themselves to weaving subtle intrigues against us who were 'tyrannising' over them — indeed, this was their constant accusation — and were not allowing them to betray their own freedom in a vile manner. But I have said enough about these distressing topics.[4]

With these words Manuel closed this sad chapter in his life history. When Thessaloniki fell into the hands of the Turks, Demetrios Kydones did not put the blame on his compatriots. "In the struggle against the barbarians," he explained,

---

1. Ep. 77 (Loenertz I 110 lines 18–23); Dennis, op.cit. 55–6.
2. Dennis, op.cit. 87; B. Christoforides, "Ο αρχιεπίσκοπος Θεσσαλονίκης Ισίδωρος Γλαβάς και τα κοινωνικά προβλήματα της εποχής του" *EEThSPTh* 20 (1988) 553.
3. Dennis, op.cit. 85.
4. Ep. 67 (Dennis, *The Letters of Manuel II* 187.22–30); id., "The Reign of Manuel II" 87–8. Cf. also R.J. Leonertz, "Manuel Paléologue, épitre a Cabasilas" *Makedonika* 4 (1956) 38 line 20–39 line 29.

"they have given proof of valour and intelligence; they called in allies, obeyed their ruler without any jealousy or friction; they shored up, as it were, the walls of the city by their mutual union and discipline and devoted more care to it than to their individual interest. Still, they have been defeated by one whom nobody, as we know, has thus far overcome. As someone has said, to die of starvation is most miserable; for just as life is impossible without breathing, so one who lacks the most necessary nourishment can accomplish nothing." Nobody, therefore, could blame them and they would correctly be considered not as evil but as unfortunate: Τούτοις μὲν οὖν οὐδεὶς ἂν μέμψαιτο, δυστυχεῖς, οὐ κακούς, δικαίως ἂν νομισθέντας.[1]

1. Ep. 332 (Loenertz II 264 lines 19–24, 26–7); Dennis, "The Reign of Manuel II" 88.

Martha Grigoriou-Ioannidou

The καθ' ἡμᾶς γλῶσσα in the Mauros and Kouber episode (*Miracula S. Demetrii* 291)

The topic I will attempt to deal with in this paper first engaged me in research some time ago.[1] I think, however, that the conclusions I reached then have become even more valuable today. For this reason, I thought it would be useful to present these conclusions again in a version enriched with some new evidence.

Byzantinists know well that the *Miracles* of St. Demetrios,[2] far from being purely hagiological texts written with the purpose of lauding the saint's miraculous activities, contain quite a large number of historical and geographical elements of high interest. Because of this, the *Miracles* constitute an invaluable source for the history of Slav penetration into the Balkans and especially for the history of the attacks of Slav and Avar tribes against Thessaloniki in the seventh century. The present paper deals particularly with the fifth episode of the Anonymous collection of the *Miracles*, which describes the plans of two men, Mauros and Kouber, to capture Thessaloniki by deception.[3]

According to the account of the anonymous author of the second book of the *Miracles*, inside the Avar state a "new people" (νέος λαός) was formed, comprising descendants of "Romans" ('Ρωμαῖοι) who had been taken prisoner by the Avars and led into Pannonia 60 years earlier, as well as Bulgarians, Avars and other pagans (λοιποὶ ἐθνικοί).[4] The same source stresses that, although they were second or third generation prisoners and the offspring of racial admixture with various barbarians, this people had preserved their "Roman" consciousness and the desire to return to the cradle of their ancestors.[5] With the passing of the years they were recognised by

1. M. Grigoriou-Ioannidou, *Une remarque sur le récit des Miracles de Saint Démétrius* (Athens 1987).
2. P. Lemerle, *Les plus anciens recueils des miracles de Saint-Démétrius et la pénétration des Slaves dans les Balkans* (2 vols., Paris 1979–81).
3. Lemerle, *Miracles* I 227–34: Περὶ τοῦ μελετηθέντος κρυπτῶς ἐμφυλίου πολέμου κατὰ τῆς πόλεως παρὰ τοῦ Μαύρου καὶ Κούβερ τῶν Βουλγάρων.
4. Lemerle, *Miracles* I 222 translates the expression λοιποὶ ἐθνικοὶ as "autres peuplades".
5. Lemerle, *Miracles* I 227.18ff: ... τὸ 'Ιλλυρικὸν σχεδὸν ἅπαν, ... 'Ροδόπης τῶν πασῶν ἐπαρχιῶν ἔτι μὴν καὶ Θράκης καὶ τοῦ πρὸς Βυζαντίου μακροῦ τείχους, καὶ λοιπὰς πόλεις τε καὶ πολιτείας ἐκπορθήσαντες (Ἄβαροι), ἅπαντα τὸν αὐτὸν λαὸν εἰς τὸ ἐκεῖθεν πρὸς Παννονίαν μέρος τὸ πρὸς τῷ Δουναβίῳ ποταμῷ ... ἐκεῖσε οὖν, ... τὸν ἅπαντα λαὸν τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας κατέστησεν ὁ λεχθεὶς χαγάνος, ὡς αὐτῷ λοιπὸν ὑποκειμένους. Ἐξ ἐκείνου οὖν ἐπιμιγέντες μετὰ Βουλγάρων καὶ 'Αβάρων καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐθνικῶν, καὶ παιδοποιησάντων ἀπ' ἀλλήλων, καὶ λαοῦ ἀπείρου καὶ παμπόλλου γεγονότος, παῖς δὲ παρὰ πατρὸς ἕκαστος τὰς ἐνεγκαμένας παρειληφότων καὶ τὴν ὁρμὴν τοῦ γένους κατὰ τῶν ἠθῶν τῶν 'Ρωμαίων, ... καὶ θάτερος θατέρῳ περὶ τῶν πατρίων τοποθεσιῶν ἀφηγούμενος, ἀλλήλοις πῦρ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις τῆς ἀποδράσεως ὑφῆπτον. Χρόνων γὰρ

Byzantine Macedonia. Identity Image and History. Edited by John Burke & Roger Scott (*Byzantina Australiensia* 13, Melbourne 2000).

the chagan as "a separate nation" (ἴδιον ἔθνος), and Kouber was appointed their leader.[1] Kouber, complying with their will, undertook the task of leading them back to their places of origin.[2] They then rebelled against the chagan, defeated him at the conclusion of five or six battles and, crossing the Danube, finally arrived in the plain of Keramesios (Κεραμήσιος κάμπος).[3]

ἀλλήλοις πῦρ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις τῆς ἀποδράσεως ὑφῆπτον. Χρόνων γὰρ ἐξήκοντα ἤδη που καὶ πρὸς διαδραμόντων ἀφ' ἧς εἰς τοὺς αὐτῶν γεννήτορας ἡ παρὰ τῶν βαρβάρων γεγένηται πόρθησις, καὶ λοιπὸν ἄλλος νέος ἐκεῖσε λαὸς ἀνεφαίνετο ... "

1. Kouber's nationality and identity remain unknown. There is no single reference in *Miracles* which could inform us whether he was a Roman, Avar, Slav or Bulgarian. There is just one reference to him, as a Bulgarian, in the title of the episode in the only manuscript (Paris. gr. 1517, 12th C.), which preserves the second or 'anonymous' collection of the Miracles (see Lemerle, *Miracles* I 15f). This fact alone makes the Bulgarian (protobulgarian) nationality of Kouber almost certain (cf. Lemerle, *Miracles* II 143: "Kouber est en effet presque certainement bulgare ..."). Nobody seems to doubt that a title in a manuscript written so much later (twelfth century) can be considered sound enough evidence. Nothing actually precludes us from regarding this title as the addition of a later copyist who, arbitrarily and probably influenced by the situation in his own era, came to characterise the two principal actors in the episode as Bulgarians. See also M. Grigoriou-Ioannidou, "Τὸ ἐπεισόδιο τοῦ Κοῦβερ στὰ Θαύματα τοῦ Ἁγίου Δημητρίου", *Byzantiaka* 1 (1981) 80–1. Furthermore, there are no other sources that mention Kouber. Scholars who insist on considering him to be indisputably Bulgarian go to some lengths to identify him with a person of the same nationality mentioned in the sources. Some of them correlate him with Kouvrat, the first king of the Bulgarians, while others come to the conclusion that he was the fourth son of Kouvrat, to whom the sources refer anonymously. This last 'Kouber' — the Kouber of the *Miracula* and the anonymous son of Kouvrat — is the person whom contempoary scholars see in the Madara inscription published by V. Beševliev, *Die protobulgarischen Inschriften* (Berlin 1963) no. 1 C, p. 97. Lemerle, *Miracles* I 145 seems to agree with this opinion, but he also expresses certain reservations which I consider to be of great importance: " ... nous ignorons tout du sort de Kouber après les événements de II.5, soit à l'occasion d'accords conclus par Constantin IV avec les Bulgares, soit de la rupture de ces accords par Justinien II et de la campagne contre 'les Sklavinies et les Bulgaries' qui en 688–689 la conduira jusqu'à Thessalonique." He concludes, however, that: "Mais il parait raisonnable d'adopter cette hypothèse, en attendant qu'un nouveau document apporte une confirmation décisive". For more details about the various identifications of Kouber and my observations on them see "Τὸ ἐπεισόδιο τοῦ Κοῦβερ" 79 n. 42. See also the study by H. Ditten, "Prominente Slawen und Bulgaren in byzantinischen Diensten (Ende des 7. bis Anfang des 10. Jahrhunderts)" *Studien zum 8. und 9. Jahrhundert in Byzanz* (Berlin 1983) 96ff.
2. Lemerle, *Miracles* I 228.18ff: Καὶ λοιπὸν ὡς ἴδιον ἔθνος προσέχων ὁ τῶν Ἀβάρων χαγάνος καθὼς τῷ γένει ἔθος ὑπῆρχεν ἄρχοντα τούτοις ἐπάνω κατέστησε, Κούβερ ὄνομα αὐτῷ. Ὅστις ἐκ τινων τῶν ἀναγκαιοτέρων προσοικειουμένων αὐτῷ μαθὼν τὴν τοῦ τοιούτου λαοῦ τῶν πατρώων πόλεων ἐπιθυμίαν, ἐν σκέψει γίνεται καὶ ἀνάστατον λαμβάνει τὸν πάντα Ῥωμαίων λαὸν μετὰ καὶ ἑτέρων ἐθνικῶν ... τουτέστι προσηλύτους, μετὰ καὶ τῆς αὐτῶν ἀποσκευῆς καὶ ὅπλων.
3. Lemerle, *Miracles* I 228.24ff: καὶ ἀνάστατοι καὶ ἀντάρται ... τοῦ χαγάνου γίνονται. Ὥστε ἐγνωκότα τὸν αὐτὸν χαγάνον, διῶξαι ὄπιθεν αὐτῶν, καὶ συμβαλόντων αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπὶ πέντε ἢ ἕξ πολέμοις καὶ ἐπ' ἀμφοτέροις

Once there, the 'Romans' of this multinational people, led out of Pannonia by Kouber,[1] sought to settle in their places of origin.[2] When they learned from the "neighbouring nations of Drougoubitae" (τὰ παρακείμενα τῶν Δρογουβιτῶν ἔθνη)[3] that Thessaloniki was nearby, they began to drift off to the city.[4] Kouber, in order to maintain the cohesion and the numeric strength of his mixed group intact, and consequently to safeguard his power, decided to impede their dispersal by drawing up a plan to capture Thessaloniki by deception. He attempted to implement his plan, sending one of his notables (τῶν αὐτοῦ ἀρχόντων) called Mauros. The text gives the following account:

> "When their aforementioned leader Kouber learned this (i.e. that many Greeks with their wives and children had started to enter the city), unable to disclose the guileful plan he had in mind, he deliberated with his counsellors — to his own destruction — and secretly decided to send one of his notables, distinguished and skilful in all things, who knew our language as well as the tongues of the Romans, the Slavs and the Bulgarians, and who in general spoke as sharp as a needle and was crafty in everything. This man was to enter our city as an alleged renegade and

---

παρ' αὐτῶν ἡττηθέντος, μετὰ τοῦ ὑπολειφθέντος αὐτοῦ λαοῦ φυγῇ χρησάμενος, ἐν τοῖς ἐνδοτέροις, πρὸς ἄρκτον ἄπεισι τόποις. Ὡς λοιπὸν μετὰ νίκης περάσαντα τὸν αὐτὸν Κούβερ μετὰ τοῦ εἰρημένου σὺν αὐτῷ παντὸς λαοῦ τὸν προαφηγηθέντα Δανούβιν ποταμόν, καὶ ἐλθεῖν εἰς τὰ πρὸς ἡμᾶς μέρη, καὶ κρατῆσαι τὸν Κεραμήσιον κάμπον. For the κεραμήσιος κάμπος see M. Grigoriou-Ioannidou, "Τὸ ἐπεισόδιο τοῦ Κοῦβερ" 70 n. 4; Lemerle, *Miracles* II 147–9.

1. As far as its ethnological composition is concerned, the people led out of Pannonia by Kouber has been considered by some scholars as a Bulgarian (protobulgarian) tribe. However, as I have shown previously ("Τὸ ἐπεισόδιο τοῦ Κοῦβερ" 74ff), the source does not actually characterise Kouber's people as Bulgarians or Avars or pure Romans; it presents them as Romans ἐπιμιγέντες and, after that, during their descent into Macedonia, as an ethnic mixture (συμμίκτως ἐξελθόντες) comprising Romans, Bulgarians, Avars and other nationalities. According to the source, when the 'Romans' departed from the Avar state they were followed by "other pagans ... that is converts" (καὶ ἕτεροι ἐθνικοί ... τουτέστι προσήλυτοι). See Lemerle, *Miracles* I 228.22–3 and 223 n. 2; a little further down (229.6), the same source notes that when they departed they were all mixed together (συμμίκτως).
2. Lemerle, *Miracles* I 228.31f: Κἀκεῖσε αὐτῶν ἐγκαθεσθέντων, τὰς πατρίους ᾐτοῦντο πόλεις, ὡς μάλιστα οἱ τῆς ὀρθοδόξου καθεστῶτες πίστεως ...
3. It is accepted that Drougoubites were located North-North-West of Thessaloniki, in the area of Veria; see Lemerle, *Miracles* 2: 88–9 and 120 with a bibliography. See also M. Grigoriou-Ioannidou, "Τὸ ἐπεισόδιο τοῦ Κοῦβερ" 70 n. 6; Ai. Christophilopoulou, "Βυζαντινή Μακεδονία", *Byzantina* 12 (1983) 33–4; J. Karayannopoulos, *Το βυζαντινό διοικητικό σύστημα στα Βαλκάνια (4ος–9ος αι.)* (Athens 1994) 17.
4. Lemerle, *Miracles* I 229.12ff: Καὶ τῷ τρόπῳ τοῦ ἐπισιτισμοῦ εἰσελθόντων πλείστων εἰς τὰς Σκλάβων σκηνάς, καὶ διερωτησάντων περὶ τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς πόλεως, καὶ ἀκριβωθέντες ὡς ἐκ μήκους μὴ ὑπάρχειν ταύτην, ἤρξαντο πλεῖστοι λοιπὸν οἱ ἐκ τῶν Ῥωμαίων ὄντες μετὰ γυναικῶν καὶ τέκνων ἐν τῇ θεοσώστῳ ταύτῃ εἰσιέναι πόλει.

> pretend that he was willing to become subject to the faithful emperor, thus giving the chance to many people with the same intentions as his to enter our city together with him and capture it by arousing civil war. Immediately afterwards Kouber would settle in the city accompanied by the rest of his household and the notables, and from this fortified position he would attack the neighbouring nations and conquer them. Furthermore he planned to fight against the islands and Asia and finally even the emperor himself."[1]

However, their plans of conquest eventually fell through, when, thanks to the miraculous intervention of St. Demetrios, General Sisinnios, leader of the fleet, arrived in time and saved the city from this threat.[2]

Kouber chose the notable called Mauros to put his deceitful plan into action.[3] Mauros was particularly skilful in everything (πανοῦργος ἐν πᾶσι) and, according

---

1. Tr. Lemerle, *Miracles* I 223–4; see the Greek text, ibid. 229.18ff: Τούτου δὲ γνωσθέντος παρὰ τοῦ εἰρημένου αὐτῶν Κούβερ, καὶ μὴ δυναμένου τὸν ἐγκείμενον ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ἀποκαλύψαι δόλον, ἐσκέψατο μετὰ τῶν αὐτοῦ συμβούλων ἐπὶ οἰκείᾳ ἀπωλείᾳ καὶ γνώμῃ, καὶ ταύτην κρυφηδὸν βουλὴν ἱστᾷ (sc. Kouber), ὥστε τινὰ τῶν αὐτοῦ ἀρχόντων ἔξοχον ὄντα καὶ πανοῦργον ἐν πᾶσι, καὶ τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐπιστάμενον γλῶσσαν καὶ τὴν Ρωμαίων, Σκλάβων καὶ Βουλγάρων, καὶ ἁπλῶς ἐν πᾶσιν ἠκονημένον καὶ γέμοντα πάσης δαιμονικῆς μηχανῆς, ἀνάστατον γενέσθαι, καὶ τῇ καθ' ἡμᾶς καὶ αὐτὸν τὸ δοκεῖν ὡς τοὺς λοιποὺς προσπελάσαι θεοφυλάκτῳ πόλει, καὶ δοῦλον ἑαυτὸν προσποιήσασθαι τοῦ πιστοῦ βασιλέως, καὶ λαὸν μετ' αὐτοῦ πλεῖστον εἰσβαλεῖν πρὸς ἡμᾶς τὰ αὐτοῦ δὴ φρονοῦντας. καὶ ἔνθεν καὶ ἐκ τῶν τρόπων τούτων τὴν πόλιν δι' ἐμφυλίου πολέμου ἑλεῖν, ἐνταῦθα δηλονότι μετὰ τῆς αὐτῆς πόρθησιν ὀφείλοντος ἐγκαταστῆναι τοῦ λεχθέντος Κούβερ μετὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ ἀποσκευῆς καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀρχόντων. καὶ ἔνθεν ὠχυρωμένον ἀντιπαρατάσσεσθαι τῶν πέριξ ἐθνῶν, καὶ τούτων δεσπόζειν, καὶ πολεμεῖν τὰς νήσους καὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τὸν τὸ κράτος ἔχοντα τῆς βασιλείας.
2. Op.cit. I 230.27ff.
3. Op.cit. I 229.32ff: Ταύτης οὖν τῆς σκέψεως καὶ γνώμης, καὶ ὅρκῳ τὸ παρ' αὐτῶν βουλευθὲν πιστοποιησάντων, τὸ δοκεῖν τις ἐξ αὐτῶν, Μαῦρος τοὔνομα, πρόσφυξ ἐν τῇ καθ' ἡμᾶς γίνεται πόλει. In Paris. gr. 1517 (12th C.), which contains the title of the episode, Mauros and Kouber are both referred to as Bulgarians. I have already expressed above my doubts about the evidential value of a title contained in a very much later manuscript (see n. 6 above). Mauros is identified by scholars with Μαῦρος πατρίκιος καὶ ἄρχων τῶν Σερμησιάνων καὶ Βουλγάρων, as we can read in the seal published in Zacos, *Seals* I no. 934, dated to the end of seventh or the beginning of the eighth century. Mauros is also identified with the Mauros Bessos mentioned by Theophanes and Nichephorus in the year 711. This Mauros, as the testimony of these two authors informs us, was charged by order of Justinian II with the destruction of Cherson: see *Nikephoros, Patriarch of Constantinople, Short History* 45.110 (ed. C. Mango, Washington D.C. 1990, 56ff): "Ετερον δὲ μέγαν στόλον ἀποστέλλει [Justinian II], ἡγεῖσθαι τούτου προχειρισάμενος Μαῦρον τὸν πατρίκιον, προστάξας τὴν μὲν πόλιν Χερσῶνος καταστρέψασθαι καὶ ἅπαντας τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ κατακτεῖναι; cf. also Theoph. I 379.17ff: ... πλώιμον ἕτερον κατασκευάσας ἀποστέλλει Μαῦρον τὸν πατρίκιον, τὸν Βέσσον ... This identification was first proposed by E. Chryssanthopoulos, "Τὰ βιβλία τῶν

to the testimony of the text, knew τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς ... γλῶσσαν καὶ τὴν 'Ρωμαίων, Σκλάβων καὶ Βουλγάρων.[1] This passage, and particularly the phrase τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐπιστάμενον γλῶσσαν καὶ τὴν Ρωμαίων, Σκλάβων καὶ Βουλγάρων, has to date failed to raise any questions among scholars. H. Grégoire,[2] F. Barisic,[3], E. Chryssanthopoulos,[4] G. Ostrogorsky,[5] V. Beševliev,[6] P.

Θαυμάτων τοῦ 'Αγίου Δημητρίου, τὸ Χρονικόν τῆς Μονεμβασίας καὶ αἱ σλαβικαὶ ἐπιδρομαὶ εἰς τὴν 'Ελλάδα" *Theologia* 26 (1955) 598ff. It was also put forward, but without any reference to Chryssanthopoulos, by Lemerle, *Miracles* II 152–3. Lemerle adds that the patrician Mauros Bessus of the *Chronicles* and the patrician Mauros of the seal mentioned above, and of two more seals (nos. 1552 and 1168), is the same person as the Mauros of the *Miracles* or his son. The latter, as the Anonymous author of the episode informs us, had revealed to the Byzantine emperor τὸ μελετηθὲν κατὰ τῆς ἡμῶν πόλεως ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ Κούβερ and τὴν δολιότητα καὶ φαῦλον πρόθεσιν τοῦ μνημονευθέντος Μαύρου (Lemerle, *Miracles* I 233.15ff). There is some disagreement about the date of the seal; see on this subject M. Grigoriou-Ioannidou, "Τὸ ἐπεισόδιο τοῦ Κοῦβερ" n. 71, and H. Ditten, "Prominente Slawen und Bulgaren" 97ff.

1. Lemerle, *Miracles* I 229.22.
2. H. Grégoire, "L'origine et le nom des Croates et des Serbes" *Byzantion* 17 (1944/45) 113: " ... Mauros, qui se donna come transfuge et profita de sa connaissance des quatre langues: grec, latin, bulgare et slave".
3. F. Barisic, *Cuda Dimitrija Solunskog Kao istoriski izvori* (Belgrade 1953) 127: "Maur ... i Koji je znao grcki, latinski, slovenski i bulgarski jezik" ('Mauros ... who knew Greek, Latin, Slavic and Bulgarian').
4. E. Chryssanthopoulos, "Τὰ βιβλία τῶν Θαυμάτων" 618: "Of course ἡ καθ' ἡμᾶς γλῶσσα is the Greek language ... But what can he mean by saying the Romans' language? It is evident that he means the vulgar Latin language of the populations in Thrace, from which after a time proceeded the contemporary Rumanian and the 'Βλαχικὴ' of the 'Κουτσοβλάχοι' language".
5. G. Ostrogorsky, "Byzantium in the Seventh Century" *DOP* 13 (1959) 17: " ... Mauros, who in the words of Miracula was skilfull in all things and knew the Greek, Latin, Slavic and Bulgar tongues".
6. V. Beševliev, "Randbemerkungen über die 'Miracula Sancti Demetrii'" *Byzantina* 2 (1970) 294: "Er (Mauros) war sehr schlau und konnte ausser bulgarisch noch griechisch, lateinisch und slawisch".

Charanis,[1] A. Toynbee,[2] A. Stratos[3] and others[4] have translated τὴν γλῶσσαν Ῥωμαίων, Σκλάβων καὶ Βουλγάρων as the Latin, Slav and Bulgarian languages respectively, and the phrase τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς γλῶσσαν as the "Greek language".

In his edition of the collection of the *Miracles*, however, the eminent scholar P. Lemerle suggests a different point of view. He regards τὴν γλῶσσαν Ῥωμαίων as the Greek language and τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς γλῶσσαν as "our language" (with no precise specification), translating the passage as follows: " ... sachant bien notre langue ainsi que celle des Grecs, des Sklaves et des Bulgares" ('knowing well our language as well as the tongues of the Greeks, the Slavs and the Bulgars'). Commenting further on this sentence, he says that he considers it either as a clumsy expression or as referring to a particular dialect of Thessaloniki, a dialect which did not pertain to the Greek language, but he does not specify at this point which language he means: "either the expression is very clumsy or we have here to

1. P. Charanis, "Kouver, the Chronology of his Activities and their Ethnic Effects on the Regions around Thessalonica" *BalkSt* 11 (1970) 245: "Mauros learned to speak besides Bulgar, which was his native tongue, also Slavic, Greek and Latin".
2. A. Toynbee, *Constantine Porphyrogenitus and his World* (London 1973) 74: " ... (Mauros) spoke Greek, Latin, Slavonic, and Bulgar".
3. A. Stratos, *Τὸ Βυζάντιον στὸν Ζ' αἰῶνα* (Athens 1974) V 80 n. 322: "This [The Book of the Miracles] ... explicitly mentions that, apart from τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐπιστάμενον γλῶσσαν, which is the language that the author was writing, i.e. Greek, he also knew the languages [τῶν] Ῥωμαίων (that is Latin), Σκλάβων καὶ Βουλγάρων. This opinion is also expressed by P. Christou, Ἡ γραμματεία τῶν Δημητρείων Α'. Διηγήσεις περὶ τῶν Θαυμάτων τοῦ Ἁγίου Δημητρίου (Thessaloniki 1993) 115: "From the moment that the author uses the Greek, by saying τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς γλῶσσαν, he chiefly means the language used by him in this text: that is the Greek language".
4. S. Bernardinello, "In margine alla questione rumena nella letteratura bizantina del XII secolo" *ZRVI* 18 (1978) 100, considers the καθ' ἡμᾶς γλῶσσαν as Greek and the mother-tongue of Mauros. I do not, however, agree with his view that Ῥωμαίων means the Rumanian language: " ... la testimonianza della Vita di S.Demetrio di Tessalonica nella quale è stata rilevata una distinzione netta, stabilita dall'autore stesso, fra la sua lingua materna, il greco, e quella dei Rumeni, degli Slavi e dei Bulgari ... " H. Gelzer, *Die Genesis der byzantinischen Themenverfassung* (Leipzig 1899) 49, translates the καθ' ἡμᾶς γλῶσσαν as Latin, as is clear from the sequence in which the Greek terms are translated, and he renders Ῥωμαίων as Greek: "Er (Mauros) spricht lateinisch, griechisch, slawisch, bulgarisch." He also remarks (ibid. 49 n. 1) that the tongue mentioned in the passage was still their Turkish idiom. C. Diehl and G. Marçais, *Histoire du Moyen Age* III: *Le monde orientale de 395 á 1081* (Paris 1936) 217, simply mention the Greek without any particular distinction: "Il (Kouber) chargea un de ses chefs, nommé Mauros, homme fort habile et qui savait bien le grec, de se présenter comme transfuge dans la ville". Cf. also A. Guillou, *Régionalisme et indépendance dans l'empire byzantin au VIIe siècle. L'example de l'exarchat et de la Pentapole d'Italie* (Rome 1969) 251 n. 111: "Mauros, un des principaux personnages de la ville, parle le grec, le 'slave' (=Sklavène) et le bulgare."

understand that in Thessaloniki people spoke a language which was not exactly the Greek language".[1]

At the same time, Lemerle refers to the fourth episode of the first collection of the *Miracles* (known as the collection of the Archbishop John). The episode is titled "On the possessed" (Περὶ δαιμονιωντῶν).[2] The hero of the episode, the "possessed" (δαιμονιῶν) soldier, had been taken to the church of St. Demetrios to be cured by the miraculous intervention of the saint when he suddenly began asking questions in the Roman language (ἔφθασεν αὐτὸς τῇ Ῥωμαϊκῇ γλώττῃ ἐρωτῶν αὐτοὺς ἀπροσδοκήτως).[3] Lemerle, who prefers to translate the "in the Roman language" (τῇ Ῥωμαϊκῇ γλώττῃ) as "in the Greek language", comments on this passage by formulating the following question: "Why is this detail noted? Does it concern a soldier of non-Greek descent, or is he used to speaking in the dialect of Thessaloniki?"[4]

It is thus evident that the editor of the *Miracles* considers that "our language" (ἡ καθ' ἡμᾶς γλῶσσα) is to be distinguished from the "Roman language" of the two episodes with Mauros and the possessed soldier: the "Roman language" signifies the "Greek language", while "our language" (ἡ καθ' ἡμᾶς γλῶσσα) is a dialect of Thessaloniki which, moreover, "is not exactly the Greek language" (n'est pas exactement la langue grecque).[5]

In addition to these observations, Lemerle refers to the fourth episode of the Anonymous collection of the *Miracles*, "On the affair of Perboundos, the famine and the relentless siege" (Περὶ τῆς κατὰ τὸν Περβοῦνδον λιμοῦ καὶ ἀνενδότου πολιορκίας)[6] According to the account of the anonymous author, when the eparch of Thessaloniki was informed that the leader of the Slav tribe of the Rynchinoi, a man called Perboundos, intended to march against the city, he reported this to the emperor, who ordered Perboundos to be arrested and transferred to Constantinople. The Rynchinoi and the Slavs of Strymon asked the eparch to forgive Perboundos. A deputation consisting both of Thessalonians and Slavs was sent to Constantinople to ask the emperor to release Perboundos. The emperor committed himself to release him when the war against the Arabs he was preparing for at this time was over. Perboundos, however, misled by someone who professed to be the "imperial hermeneutes" (βασιλικὸς ἑρμηνευτής) escaped through the Vlachernae gate, only to be arrested sometime later and sent back to prison. After a second attempt to escape he was arrested again and, after having confessed during his trial that he intended to organise a conspiracy, he was sentenced to death and executed. The episode continues with the revolution of the Rynchinoi who, joining forces with the Slavs of Strymon, the Sagoudates and the Drougoubitae, laid a tight siege

1. Lemerle, *Miracles* I 223 n. 3.
2. Tr. Lemerle, *Miracles* I 82–3; see the Greek text, ibid. 84–6.
3. Op.cit. I 86.8.
4. Op.cit. I 83 n. 4.
5. Loc.cit.
6. Tr. Lemerle, *Miracles* I 198–208; see the Greek text, ibid. 208–21.

against Thessaloniki. Finally, due to a miracle of St. Demetrios, the city was saved from the famine and delivered from the siege.

What is of particular interest for us in this episode is the passage in paragraph 235 which mentions that "King Perboundos, dressed like a Roman and speaking the Greek language,[1] went out through the gate of Vlachernae as one of the citizens" (ὁ ῥὴξ Περβοῦνδος, ὡς φορῶν ῥωμαῖον σχῆμα καὶ λαλῶν τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ διαλέκτῳ, ὡς εἷς τῶν πολιτῶν ἔξεισι τῆς ἐν Βλαχέρναις πύλης).[2] Lemerle, who translates the phrases ῥωμαῖον σχῆμα and ἡμετέρα διάλεκτος as "à la grecque" and "(il parlait) grec", suggests that the information given in this passage should be related to what has been recounted previously, and concludes with the following words: "Are we to assume that Perboundos speaks Greek or the dialect of Thessaloniki?"[3] He thus weakens his earlier assertion that the phrase ἡμετέρα διάλεκτος signifies the dialect of Thessaloniki.

Lemerle returns to his point on the dialect of Thessaloniki, though with some reservations on the matter, in the second volume of his work, which forms a commentary. He underlines the fact that this problem is really very embarrassing: "In fact, as we have already shown, the three passages we have referred to in our collection of Miracles suggest a difficult and embarrassing problem, namely that of a dialect of Thessaloniki."[4]

But let us take things one by one. In *Miracles* 291 (the episode of Kouber), ἡ καθ' ἡμᾶς γλῶσσα stands opposed to the language of the Romans and, further, to the languages of the S[k]lavs and Bulgarians. Consequently ἡ καθ' ἡμᾶς γλῶσσα was neither Slav nor Bulgarian nor Roman.[5] In my view we can find the exact meaning in paragraph 235 (the episode of Perboundos), which we mentioned above. We read there that Perboundos ὡς φορῶν ῥωμαῖον σχῆμα καὶ λαλῶν τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ διαλέκτῳ, ὡς εἷς τῶν πολιτῶν ἔξεισι τῆς ἐν Βλαχέρναις πύλης. This passage makes clear that the ἡμετέρα διάλεκτος, which Perboundos spoke, must have been a Greek language and specifically a language spoken by the ordinary citizens of Constantinople. It cannot have been the Latin language or a dialect pertaining to a certain city, whether Thessaloniki or a city of some other region.

---

1. Op.cit. I 199.
2. Op.cit. I 209. 29–31.
3. Op.cit. I 83 n. 4.
4. See Lemerle, *Miracles* II 150 nn. 233 and 244 no. 9. A similar opinion was formulated some time ago by G.L.F. Tafel, *De Thessalonica eiusque agro dissertatio geographica* (Berlin 1839) 99: "Quo audito Cuberus ducum suorum militarium aliquem, nomine Maurum, hominem astutum, linguarum Macedonicae, Graecae, Slavicae et Bulgaricae gnarum, impellit ... " Cf. also A. Guillon, *Régionalisme et indépendance dans l'empire Byzantin au VIIe siècle, L'Exemple de l'exarchat et la Pentapole d'Italie* (Rome 1969) 151: "Quelle devait être à l'égard de Thessalonique, latine hier et où l'on parlait maintenant des dialectes si barbares, la défiance des hommes de la capitale qui s'hellénisaient définitivement!".
5. Ῥωμαϊκή can mean either Latin (i.e. the language spoken by Romans) but also Greek (the language of the Romans = the Byzantines, citizens of the Roman = Byzantine Empire).

It follows that the ἡμετέρα διάλεκτος of paragraph 235[1] corresponds to the Greek language and, furthermore, to the language καθ' ἡμᾶς of paragraph 291.[2] As for the language of the Romans ('Ρωμαίων) of paragraph 291,[3] it can only be the Latin language.

This view finds support in the Slav translation of the *Miracles*, which forms part of the Slav translation of the Menaia (Μηναῖα) (collection of Makarios). There, the ἡμετέρα διάλεκτος in the Perboundos episode is rendered as "the Greek language" (ἑλληνικὴ γλῶσσα).[4]

The question which now arises is why the author of the *Miracles* did not refer directly and clearly to the "Greek language". The answer is simple. It is enough to recall that the author of the *Miracles* could not have used the expression ἑλληνὶς or ἑλληνικὴ διάλεκτος or φωνὴ instead of ἡμετέρα διάλεκτος because the word Ἕλλην and its derivatives had the special meaning "pagan" at this period.[5]

It remains to focus on the expression 'Ρωμαϊκῇ γλώττῃ of paragraph 49[6] (the episode of the possessed soldier), which could signify the Latin language if it refers to a soldier who was not Greek, as Lemerle tends to believe.[7] Nevertheless, it is possible that it might signify the Greek language. Given that the terms ῥωμαίος, ῥωμαϊκός ('Ρωμαίων λαός,[8] 'Ρωμαίων φῦλον,[9] γένος τῶν 'Ρωμαίων,[10] οἱ ἐκ

---

1. Lemerle, *Miracles* I 209.29–30: Περβοῦνδος ... λαλῶν τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ διαλέκτῳ ...
2. Lemerle, *Miracles* I 229.21–2: τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐπιστάμενον γλῶσσαν καὶ τὴν 'Ρωμαίων, Σκλάβων καὶ Βουλγάρων.
3. See n. 38 above.
4. *Cety Miney* (St. Petersburg 1882) col. 1930 (26 Oct.): " ... Knjar ze Prebud nosja greceskyja rizy i beseduja greceskom jazykom, ... ". Cf. also G. Ostrogorsky, "Byzantium in the Seventh Century" 18, where he says of Perboundos: "Naturally, as is explained subsequently, he spoke Greek."
5. Eusebios, *VC* II.44 (66.19–20): ... ὅσοι δ' ἑλληνίζειν ἐδόκουν, τούτοις θύειν ἀπείρητο (Constantine the Great); Sozom., *HE* 8.23 (381.10–11): Ἕλλην γὰρ ὢν ὡς ἐπεγγελῶν ταῖς συμφοραῖς τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ πρὸς ἡδονὴν ἔσχε τὸ συμβάν"; ibid. 8.1 (347.23); Malal. 449.3ff: Ἐν αὐτῷ δὲ τῷ χρόνῳ διωγμὸς γέγονεν Ἑλλήνων μέγας, ... Ἐθέσπισε δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς (Justinian I) ὥστε μὴ πολιτεύεσθαιι τοὺς ἑλληνίζοντας ... ; Theoph.Simok. 5.14 (214.14–16): Καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἡ Σειρὲμ Χριστιανή ἐστι κἀγώ (Chosroes) Ἕλλην, ὁ ἡμέτερος νόμος ἄδειαν ἡμῖν οὐ παρέχει Χριστιανὴν ἔχειν γαμετήν; Theoph. 228.30: Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει γέγονεν ἡ ἁγία καὶ οἰκουμενικὴ πέμπτη σύνοδος κατὰ Ὠριγένους ... καὶ Διδύμου ... καὶ Εὐαγρίου καὶ τῆς ἑλληνόφρονος αὐτῶν ληρῳδίας ... ; Nikeph. 80.13f.: Καὶ ἅπαν ὡς εἰπεῖν τὸ εὐσεβὲς διωθεῖτο καὶ ἀπηλαύνετο (Constantine V), καὶ ὥσπερ ἑλληνισμοῦ δευτέρου Χριστιανοῖς ἐπιφυέντος πᾶσα μηχανὴ κακουργίας ἐπενοεῖτο". See K. Lechner, *Hellenen und Barbaren im Weltbild der Byzantiner* (München 1955) 7–72; and most recently, P. Christou, Οἱ περιπέτειες τῶν ἐθνικῶν ὀνομάτων τῶν Ἑλλήνων (Thessaloniki 1991) 71–84.
6. Lemerle, *Miracles* I 86.8: ἔφθασεν αὐτὸς τῇ ῥωμαϊκῇ γλώττῃ ἐρωτῶν αὐτοὺς ἀπροσδοκήτως.
7. Lemerle, *Miracles* I 83 n. 4.
8. Lemerle, *Miracles* I 228.22.
9. Lemerle, *Miracles* I 230.11.
10. Lemerle, *Miracles* I 228.9.

τῶν Ῥωμαίων ὄντες[1] etc.) in the *Miracles* point to the inhabitants of the Byzantine state, who naturally spoke Greek, we could accept that Ῥωμαϊκὴ γλῶσσα points to the language spoken of Byzantium, that is, the Greek language.

However, this interpretation seems unlikely to me, since the language characterised as Ῥωμαϊκή or πάτριος in sources earlier than the seventh century undoubtedly signifies the Latin language. Some passages from ecclesiastical authors are characteristic in this regard. In his panegyrical biography of Constantine the Great, Eusebios of Caesarea observes: "The emperor wrote his speeches in the Roman language (Ῥωμαίᾳ γλώττῃ) and his translators were charged with rendering them into the Greek language."[2] Nevertheless, Constantine the Great, as Eusebios says, was expert in the Greek language as well (ἑλληνίζων τῇ φωνῇ).[3] That the emperor was a fluent speaker of Greek is more clearly shown in Sozomenos' *Ecclesiastical History*: "He was meekly speaking with everyone ... because he was not ignorant of the Greek language" (Ἑλλήνων γλώττης).[4] However, Constantine the Great is not the only bilingual person mentioned by Sozomenos. Let us for the sake of an example cite Sozomenos' once again, this time on the education of the Augusta Pulcheria: "Pulcheria knew how to speak and write the Roman and the Greek languages with no mistakes."[5]

In the works of the historians of the sixth century the "language of the Romans" (Ῥωμαίων φωνή) stands in opposition to the "language of the Greeks" (Ἑλλήνων φωνή or Ἑλλὰς φωνή). John Lydus recounts that, in Theodosios II's reign, an Egyptian named Cyrus, who held the two offices of praefectus urbi and praefectus praetorio simultaneously, had broken with official practice by giving his decisions not in the "language of the Romans" (τῇ Ῥωμαίων φωνῇ) but in the "Greek language" (Ἑλλάδι φωνῇ).[6] The same author also informs us that, in the middle decades of the sixth century, the members of the Constantinopolitan fire

---

1. Lemerle, *Miracles* I 229.15.
2. Eusebios, *VC* IV.32 (132.11): Ῥωμαίᾳ μὲν γλώττῃ τὴν τῶν λόγων συγγραφὴν βασιλεὺς παρεῖχε μετέβαλλον δ' αὐτὴν Ἑλλάδι μεθερμηνευταὶ φωνῇ οἷς τοῦτο ποιεῖν ἔργον ἦν; see also ibid., IV.7 (123.4–7): φέρεται μὲν οὖν Ῥωμαίᾳ γλώττῃ παρ' αὐτοῖς ἡμῖν καὶ τοῦτο τὸ βασιλέως ἰδιόγραφον γράμμα, μεταβληθὲν δ' ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλήνων φωνὴν γνωριμώτερον γένοιτ' ἂν τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσιν.
3. Eusebios, *VC* III.13 (88.9–11): πράως τε ποιούμενος τὰς πρὸς ἕκαστον ὁμιλίας ἑλληνίζων τε τῇ φωνῇ, ὅτι μηδὲ ταύτης ἀμαθῶς εἶχε.
4. Sozom., *HE* 1.20 (41.13–14): ... πράως ἑκάστῳ διαλεγόμενος, ὡς ἀκούειν ἠπίστατο, καθότι οὐδὲ τῆς Ἑλλήνων γλώττης ἀπείρως εἶχε.
5. Sozom., *HE* IX.1 (391.4–5): ἠκρίβωτο γάρ (Pulcheria) λέγειν τε καὶ γράφειν ὀρθῶς κατὰ τὴν Ῥωμαίων καὶ Ἑλλήνων φωνήν; see also ibid. IV.6 (146.5–6): ... λόγους τε τῇ Ῥωμαίων καὶ Ἑλλήνων φωνῇ συγγράφων ἐξεδίδου [Photinos]; ibid. III.15 (127.14–15); IV.6 (144.13–14).
6 *Ioannis Lydi, De magistratibus populi romani* ed. R. Wuensch (Stuttgart 1967) III.42 (131.3ff): Κύρου γάρ τινος Αἰγυπτίου, ... ἅμα τὸν πολίαρχον ⟨ἅμα⟩ τὴν τῶν πραιτωρίων ἐπαρχότητα διέποντος ... παραβῆναι θαρρήσαντος τὴν παλαιὰν συνήθειαν καὶ τὰς ψήφους Ἑλλάδι φωνῇ προενεγκότος, σὺν τῇ Ῥωμαίων φωνῇ καὶ τὴν τύχην ⟨ἀπέβαλεν⟩ ἡ ἀρχή.

brigade were still summoned in the "Roman language of their ancestors" (τῇ πατρίῳ Ῥωμαίων φωνῇ) with the cry "omnes collegiati adeste."[1] Another historian of this era, Agathias, distinguishes the Greek language (Ἑλλήνων φωνή) from the language of "Latins" when discussing a place in Laziki. He says that the place actually took its name from a pottery-market that had been installed there: "It was surnamed *Ollaria*, as a Latin would say. This name can be translated into the language of the Greeks as Χυτροπώλια."[2] The legislation of Justinian is particularly enlightening in this regard. In a novel of the year 535 the legislator observes: "We did not write this law in the language of our ancestors but in the language understood by everyone, that is the Greek, so that everyone may become familiar with it as it is easy to comprehend."[3] In another novel it is noted: "One of the exemplars [of the novel] is written in Greek, to be understood by the people, and the other in Latin, and it is the latter which is the official exemplar, since it corresponds to the character of the State."[4]

The testimony of the *Strategikon* (Στρατηγικόν) of Maurikios[5] is also noteworthy. The experienced general or emperor, who is considered as its author,[6] informs us that the announcement of the "penalties" (ἐπιτίμια) was made in front of army corps "in Roman and Greek" (Ῥωμαϊστὶ καὶ Ἑλληνιστί).[7] In another passage, enumerating the qualifications of the messengers (μανδάτορες) - vigilant, prudent, alert and with a loud voice[8] — the author notes: "[the messengers] should know Roman and Persian and, if necessary, Greek."[9] Later sources agree in this respect; the expressions γλῶσσα, φωνή or διάλεκτος Ῥωμαίων or Ῥωμαϊστί all refer to the Latin language.

Theophanes, in his *Chronicle*, mentions that Dorotheos of Tyre left after his death a great number of both "Roman" and "Greek" writings, being an expert in

---

1. Lydus, *De mag.* I.50 (53.13–15). John Lydus says also that the imperial officers of the various scrinia ought to know well the Roman language (Ῥωμαίων φωνήν), because χρειώδης ... ἦν αὐτοῖς κατὰ τἀναγκαῖον (*De mag.* III.27, 114.23ff). John Lydus himself was an expert in the Roman language (Ῥωμαίων φωνήν) and took up an appointment for teaching it on the staff of the Constantinopolitan praefectus urbi (*De mag.* III.29, 116.16ff).
2. Agath. II.20.5 (67.16–18): Ὀλλάρια γάρ, ὡς ἂν Λατῖνός τις φήσοι, ἐπωνόμασται. δύναται δὲ τοῦτο τῇ Ἑλλήνων φωνῇ Χυτροπώλια.
3. Just. *Nov.* 7.I.32–5 (535) (*CIC* III 52).
4. Just. *Nov.* 66.1.2.5–8 (538) (*CIC* III 342): ... τῆς μὲν (ἰσοτύπου διατάξεως) τῇ Ἑλλήνων φωνῇ γεγραμμένης διὰ τὸ τῷ πλήθει κατάλληλον, τῆς δὲ τῇ Ῥωμαίων, ἥπερ ἐστὶ καὶ κυριωτάτη διὰ τὸ τῆς πολιτείας σχῆμα ... See also Just. *Nov.* 47.II.10–28 (537) (*CIC* III 283ff).
5. *Das Strategikon des Maurikios*, ed. G.T. Dennis & E. Gamillscheg (Vienna 1981).
6. Op.cit. 15–18.
7. Op.cit. I.8 (98.2–3).
8. Op.cit. XII B.7 (424.3): Μανδάτορας ἀγρύπνους, συνετούς, γοργοὺς καὶ εὐφώνους.
9. Op.cit. XII B.7 (424.3–4): εἰδότας (μανδάτορας) Ῥωμαϊστὶ καὶ Περσιστί, ἐάν ἀπαντᾷ, καὶ Ἑλληνιστί.

both languages.[1] In the preamble of the Πρόχειρος νόμος we read: "We have rendered the Roman terms into Greek equivalents".[2] Leo VI notes that, during the composition of his *Tactica*, he himself was asked more than once to make clear some "Greek words" on the one hand, and on the other to translate some "Roman words", both taken from the ancient Tactics.[3] In his work *De thematibus*, Constantine Porphyrogennetos observes, when he refers to the origin of the themes and the changes introduced by the emperors after Heraclius: "They were Hellenized to a degree and rejected the language of their ancestors, that is the Roman language, for they called the chiliarchs 'longini', the hekatontarchs 'centurians' and 'counts' those whom we call generals today. And even the name 'theme' is Greek and not Roman, deriving from the Greek word θέσις."[4]

When Genesios, Constantine Porphyrogennetos, Leo Grammatikos and others find it necessary to explain some Latin names or expressions, they express themselves in the following terms: "He (Leo VI) appointed (Diakonitzes) *mensurator*, as this office is called in the Roman language";[5] "the castle of Diadora is called in Roman language *iam era*, which is translated as ἀπάρτι ἦτον";[6] finally, Leo Grammatikos remarks: "'murderer' is called *macel* in the Roman language."[7]

Interestingly enough, Constantine Porphyrogennetos, Theophanes Continuatus and others make use of such expressions as Ῥωμαίων διάλεκτος or ῥωμαϊκὴ γλῶσσα to signify the Greek language.[8] This use probably constitutes a

---

1. *Theoph.* 24.21ff: ... καὶ Δωρόθεος, ἐπίσκοπος Τύρου, ... πλεῖστα συγγράμματα καταλιπὼν Ῥωμαϊκὰ καὶ Ἑλληνικά, ὡς ἀμφοτέρων γλωσσῶν ἐμπειρότατος ...
2. *Jus Graecoromanum* ed. J. & P. Zepos (Athens 1931) II 116: τῶν δὲ Ῥωμαϊκῶν λέξεων τὴν συνθήκην εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα γλῶσσαν μετεποιήσαμεν ...
3. *Leonis Imperatoris Tactica* PG 107 col. 676C: Ὅθεν ταύτας παλαιὰς τῆς τακτικῆς πολλάκις Ἑλληνικὰς μὲν ἐσαφηνίσαμεν λέξεις, Ῥωμαϊκὰς δὲ διηρμηνεύσαμεν, ... ἕνεκεν τῆς σαφοῦς καταλήψεως τῶν ἐντυγχανόντων ...
4. *De them.* 60.24ff: ... μάλιστα ἑλληνίζοντες καὶ τὴν πάτριον καὶ Ῥωμαϊκὴν γλῶτταν ἀποβαλόντες. Λογγίνους γὰρ ἔλεγον τοὺς χιλιάρχους καὶ κεντουρίωνας τοὺς ἑκατοντάρχους καὶ κόμητας τοὺς νυνὶ στρατηγούς. Αὐτὸ γὰρ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θέματος ἑλληνικόν ἐστι καὶ οὐ Ῥωμαϊκόν, ἀπὸ τῆς θέσεως ὀνομαζόμενον. See F. Dölger, "Zur Ableitung des byzantinischen Verwaltungsterminus Θέμα" *Historia* 4 (1955) 189–98; J. Karayannopulos, *Die Entstehung der byzantinischen Themenordnung* (Munich 1959) 89ff.
5. Genes. 4.37 (88.61–2):... προεχειρίσατο μηνσουράτωρα, ὅπερ φωνῇ Ῥωμαίων οὕτω προσαγορεύεται.
6. *De adm. imp.* 29.272–3: ... τὸ κάστρον τῶν Διαδώρων καλεῖται τῇ Ῥωμαίων διαλέκτῳ 'ἰάμ ἔρα', ὅπερ ἑρμηνεύεται 'ἀπάρτι ἦτον'. Cf. also *De cer.* (ed. A.Vogt, *Le livre des ceremonies*, 2nd ed. Paris 1967) I, I.16.21–3: Ἐν δὲ τῇ ἁγίᾳ καὶ μεγάλῃ Κυριακῇ, ἤγουν τοῦ ἁγίου Πάσχα, καὶ μόνον, προστιθέασι καὶ ταύτην τὴν Ῥωμαίαν λέξιν '"Ανω, φιλλικήσιμε'.
7. Leo Gram. 113.11: μάκελ δὲ λέγεται Ῥωμαϊστὶ ὁ φονεύς.
8. *De adm. imp.* 27.69–70: Ἰστέον, ὅτι μαστρομίλης ἑρμηνεύεται τῇ Ῥωμαίων διαλέκτῳ 'κατεπάνω τοῦ στρατοῦ'; ibid. 29.263–4: "Οτι τὸ κάστρον τῶν

transitional phase in which the words ῥωμαῖος and ῥωμαϊκός begin to signify the Greek habitant of Byzantium and his language (cf. the modern Greek word Ρωμιός).[1] Nevertheless, we should not forget that these testimonies are dated three centuries later than the passage in the *Miracles* we are dealing with.

Thus, I think there can be no doubt that the language designated as καθ' ἡμᾶς in the *Miracles* is the Greek language and furthermore that there is no reason to believe in the existence of any particular "Thessalonician dialect".

Δεκατέρων ἑρμηνεύεται τῇ 'Ρωμαῖων διαλέκτῳ 'ἑστενωμένον καὶ πεπνιγμένον'; ibid. 32.12–13: Σέρβλοι δὲ τῇ 'Ρωμαίων διαλέκτῳ 'δοῦλοι' προσαγορεύονται; *TheophCont* 308.13–14: Κρίναντες δὲ δεῖν διὰ κατασκόπων πρότερον τὰ βασιλέως πράγματα κατιδεῖν, τὸν ἐποψόμενον ἕκαστα καὶ πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἀπαγγελοῦντα, 'Ρωμαίων στολῇ καὶ γλώσσῃ χρώμενον, ἐξαπέστειλαν; ibid. 407.15–16: Συμεὼν ὡς βασιλέα εὐφήμουν τῇ τῶν 'Ρωμαίων φωνῇ; cf. Symeon Magistros, ed. I. Bekker (Bonn 1838) 737:3; Skyl. 220.41.

1. See N. Politis, "'Ελληνες ἢ 'Ρωμιοί" *Laographika Symmeikta* 1 (1920) 122–33; S. Runciman, "Byzantine and Hellene in the Fourteenth Century" *Τόμος Κωνσταντίνου 'Αρμενοπούλου ἐπὶ τῇ ἑξακοσιετηρίδι τῆς 'Εξαβίβλου του (1345–1945)* (Thessaloniki 1952) 27–31; idem, *The Last Byzantine Renaissance* (Cambridge 1970) 19; H. Ditten, "Βάρβαροι, 'Ελληνες und 'Ρωμαῖοι beiden letzten byzantinischen Geschichtsschreibern" 12 CEB [Belgrade 1964] II 273–99; D. Zakythinos, Βυζαντινή 'Ιστορία 324–1071 (Athens 1972) 13–14; P. Christou, *Οἱ περιπέτειες* (see n. 41 supra) 89f., 106f.

Dionyssia Missiou

The importance of Macedonia during the Byzantine era

Throughout its long history, Macedonia has always been the bastion of Hellenism.[1] This fact was already acknowledged by the historian Polybius at the beginning of the Roman era: "We should pay great honour to the Macedonians, who spend the greater part of their lives in constant fighting against the barbarians for the safety of Greece. Who does not know that Greece would always have been in the greatest danger if we had not had the Macedonians as a bulwark."[2] This too was its role during the Byzantine era, and especially in its final stage, when the Empire was faced with a host of enemies, particularly the Turks.

After the interval of Frankish rule Michael VIII, the first of the Palaiologan dynasty, restored the Roman Empire in 1261.[3] It is said that, shortly before his triumphal entry into Constantinople, some of Michael's soldiers discovered the body of Basil II the Bulgar-slayer in a monastery where he had been buried in 1025. The monastery was then in ruins and being used to house animals. The body, naked from head to toe, was still complete and intact but the locals had mocked it by putting the reed of a shepherd's pipe in its mouth. The historian goes on to describe the considerable pomp and ceremony of the reburial which Michael now arranged as a way of showing his great respect for the relic.[4] To me the episode symbolises not only the restoration of the empire but also the importance Macedonia had for the Palaiologan Empire: Michael VIII Palaiologos recovered all the territories in western and north-western Macedonia, while Basil II was the most important emperor of the Macedonian dynasty, which some claim was descended from Alexander of Macedonia, Alexander the Great.

Many scholars have studied the question of the origin of Basil I, the founder of the so-called Macedonian dynasty, and it is now generally held that he was of Armenian descent.[5] Everything we know about Basil I, and consequently about his origins, dates from after his ascent to the throne and so must be considered as forming part of this dynastic propaganda. The historians from the Macedonian era took the view that the founder of the Macedonian dynasty was a descendant of Constantine the Great, that he was a scion of the (Armenian) Arsacid family and

---

1. A. Vacalopoulos, *History of Macedonia 1354–1833* (Thessaloniki 1973) 5.
2. Polybius IX 35.
3. On the Roman idea in the time of the Palaiologoi see D.A. Zakythinos, "Rome dans la pensée politique de Byzance du XIIIe au XVe siècle. La théorie 'romaine' à l'épreuve des faits" *Βυζάντιον. Αφιέρωμα στον Α. Ν. Στράτο* (Athens 1986) I 209–221.
4. George Pachymeres, *On Michael and Andronikos Palaiologos* II 21, ed A. Failler, *Relations historiques* (Paris 1984) 175–7, with bibliography.
5. N. Adontz, "L'âge et l'origine de l'empereur Basile Ier (867–886)" *Byzantion* 9 (1934) 223–60; A.N. Bees, "Eine unbeachtete Quelle über die Abstammung des Kaisers Basilios I des Mazedoniers" *BNJbb* 4 (1923) 76; P.G. der Sahaghian, "Un document arménien de la généalogie de Basil Ier" *BZ* 20 (1911) 165–76.

Byzantine Macedonia. Identity Image and History. Edited by John Burke & Roger Scott (*Byzantina Australiensia* 13, Melbourne 2000).

that he was descended from the Macedonian kings Philip and Alexander.[1] The most important question for the historian, then, is not whether there is any basis for these claims, or which of these versions, if any, corresponds to the truth but rather, given that the whole thing was an exercise in propaganda, to determine its purpose. It is my belief that these legends had a dual purpose: to provide the founder of the dynasty with a noble origin, and to make its members acceptable to the imperial army, whose two most important corps were those of the Armenians and the Macedonians. The other question which I find extremely significant is why Basil was described only as a Macedonian,[2] especially since in all probability he was in fact Armenian, and why during the final years of the Empire the historical sources refer only to Basil I's Macedonian heritage.[3] The answer to these questions is, I think, also related to the particular importance of Macedonia, especially during the Empire's final years, when it formed the major portion of its territory.

The particular importance that Macedonia acquired during the Empire's struggle against a host of enemies, with the Turks first and foremost, was largely ideological in nature, having to do with the dissemination of the romance of Alexander the Great. This story was the written form of the myth created by Alexander himself[4] and filled out by popular imagination, distorting the actual historical events in such a way that the Alexander of the legend is quite a different figure from the historical Alexander. This legend acquired an ideological baggage appropriate to the climate of the times, including, for example, the incorporation of the legend of Gog and Magog, the evil people who, according to the prophecy of Ezekiel and confirmed in the Apocalypse,[5] will burst forth in the last days and accompany Satan to ravage the earth before their final destruction. The story as it developed in the romance took the form that Alexander had built a gate in the north, behind which the people of Gog and Magog were confined until their destined outbreak at the end of the world; these people were identified with the nations which were threatening Europe.[6] This story was taken as predicting the final victory

1. Genes. 107; *TheophCont* 215–6; Cedr. 184.
2. Basil I owed his epithet 'Macedonian' to the fact, that his family had been established in Macedonia since the reign of Leo I (457–74); he himself was born in Adrianopolis, a town in Thrace which administratively belonged to the theme of Macedonia.
3. G. Moravcsik, "Ανώνυμον αφιερωματικόν ποίημα περί του αυτοκράτορος Βασιλείου Α'" *Εις μνήμην K. Αμάντου 1874–1960* (Athens 1960) 10.
4. W. Gawlowska, "Alexandre le grand créateur de sa propre légende (à la lumière des sources greco-latines" *Concilium Eirene* XVI (vol. I, Prague 1983) 65-9.
5. Ezek 38.1–39.16; Apoc 20.7–10.
6. On the Gog and Magog legend see A.R. Anderson, "Alexander and the Caspian Gates" *TAPA* 59 (1928) 130–63; id., *Alexander's Gate, Gog and Magog and the Enclosed Nations* (Cambridge, MA 1932); F. Pfister, *Alexander der Große in den Offenbarungen der Griechen, Juden, Mohammedaner und Christen* (Berlin 1956) 24–35; D.J.A. Ross, *Alexander Historiatus. A guide to medieval illustrated Alexander literature* (London 1963) 34f.

of the Christian nations over the foreign hordes menacing Europe.[1] The Alexander romance[2] became very popular in the East and the West alike, as is demonstrated by numerous translations[3] and the production of many fine illustrated manuscripts.[4]

---

1. W. Gawlowska, "Le mythe de Gog and Magog dans le légende d'Alexandre le Grand" *Troisième Congrès Association Internationale de Litterature Comparée 1991, Tokyo. Congres Proceedings* III: *Vision in History* (Stanford, CA 1992).
2. See W. Kroll, "Kallisthenes" *RE* X.2 1710–13. Editions of the Greek recensions of the Alexander Romance: C. Müller, *Pseudo-Callisthenes* (Paris 1846); H. Meusel, "Pseudo-Callisthenes nach der Leidener Handschrift" *Jahrbücher für Klassische Philologie* suppl. 5 (Leipzig 1871) 701ff; W. Kroll, *Historia Alexandri Magni. Recensio vetusta* (Berlin 1926, rp. 1958); H. van Thiel, *Die Rezension λ des Pseudo-Kallisthenes* (Bonn 1959); L. Bergson, *Der griechische Alexanderroman, Rezension b* (*Studia Graeca Stockholmiensia* 3, Göteborg-Stockholm-Uppsala 1965); U. von Lauenstein, H. Engelmann & F. Parthe, *Der griechische Alexanderroman, Rezension Γ* (*Beiträge zur Klassischen Philologie* 4, 12 & 33, Meisenheim am Glan 1962, 1963, 1969); K. Mitsakis, Διήγησις περί του Αλεξάνδρου και των μεγάλων πολέμων, *BNJbb* 20 (1968) 218–302; H. van Thiel, *Leben und Taten Alexanders von Makedonien. Der griechische Alexanderroman nach der Handschrift L* (Darmstadt 1974); J. Trumpf, *Anonymi Byzantini Vita Alexandri regis Macedonum* (Stuttgart 1974); E. Phlytouris, *Ψευδο-Καλλισθένης: Η πεζή μεσαιωνική ελληνική διασκευή του μυθιστορήματος για τον Μέγα Αλέξανδρο κατά τον κώδικα των Μετεώρων (κωδ. Μετεώρων Π. 400, Ι. Μ. Μεταμορφώσεως)* (MA diss., Thessaloniki 1990).
3. The romance was translated into Armenian, Turkish, Georgian, Persian, Syriac, Arabic, Ethiopian, Coptic, Hebrew and Mongolian. The most important of the translations is the Armenian edited by R. Raabe, *Ιστορία Αλεξάνδρου* (Leipzig 1896). There were two Latin translations, the first by Julius Valerius and the second by the archpriest Leo: B. Kübler, *Juli Valeri Alexandri Polemi res gestae Alexandri Macedonis translatae ex Aesopo Graeco* (Leipzig 1888); O. Zingerle, "Historia de preliis" *Die Quellen zum Alexander des Rudolf von Ems* (Breslau 1885) 127ff; F. Pfister, *Der Alexanderroman des Archipresbyters Leo* (Heidelberg 1913); H.-J. Bergmeister, *Die Historia de preliis Alexandri magni* (diss., Meisenheim am Glan 1975); K. Steffens, *Die Historia de preliis Alexandri Magni Rezension j^3* (Meisenheim am Glan 1975). These translations begat à mass of medieval Alexander material in French, German, Italian, Spanish, English, Swedish, Danish and Czech. For the popularity of the Alexander Romance see P. Meyer, *Alexandre le Grand dans la littérature francaise du moyen âge* (2 vols, Paris 1886); M. Tcheraz, "La légende d'Aléxandre le Grand chez les Armeniens" *RHR* 43–4 (1901) 345–51; A. Abel, *Le roman d'Alexandre, Légendaire médiéval* (Brussels 1955); G. Cary, *The Medieval Alexander* (Cambridge 1956); D.J.A. Ross, *Studies in the Alexander Romance* (London 1985).
4. See K. Weitzmann, *Greek Mythology in Byzantine Art* (Princeton 1951) 104; A. Grabar, *Recherches sur les influences orientales dans l'art balkanique* (Paris-Oxford 1928) 109–133 with pls. XII–XVI, on the Sofia illustrated manuscript; D. Christians & E. Trapp, *Die serbische Alexandreis nach der Sofioter illustrierten Handschrift Nr. 771* (Cologne-Weimar-Vienna1991); J. Vorderstemann, *Johann Hartliebs Alexanderbuch. Eine unbekannte illustrierte Handschrift von 1461 in der hessischen Landes- und Hochschulbibliothek Darmstadt (Hs 4256). Mit Abbildungen und einem neuen Handschriftenverzeichnis* (Göttingen 1976); A.A. Palles, *Η φυλλάδα του Μεγ. Αλεξάνδρου του Μακεδόνος. Βίος, πόλεμοι και θάνατος αυτού* (Athens 1991), with photographs from Persian and Indian manuscripts. For the Greek illustrated manuscripts see A. Xyngopoulos, *Αι μικρογραφίαι του Μυθιστορήματος του Μ. Αλεξάνδρου εις τον κώδικα του Ελληνικού Ινστιτούτου της Βενετίας* (Athens-Venice 1965)

The result of the widespread dissemination of the legend of Alexander the Great was to convince the Eastern nations fighting against the Hellenic Christian Empire of Constantinople that they were destined to be defeated by the Macedonians.

In the Koran one reads at least two anecdotes which are related to the Alexander romance. One of these refers to the construction of the renowned iron gate by Alexander, which served to obstruct the passage of the savage nomadic Northern people, the Gog and the Magog. In the Koran Alexander is not named but is referred to as 'Double horned' (*Doul-Karnein*).[1] Arab historians and theologians, particularly at the time of Mohammed, attempted to appropriate the attributes of the Macedonian leader (it should however be stressed that in general they did consider him Greek) and prove (unsuccessfully, however) that the builder of the gate was not Alexander the son of Philip but one of the Arab monarchs from Yemen.[2] In the eleventh century, according to Michael Glykas, Constantine IX Monomachos sent against the Turks "his Macedonian forces ... since there was a rumour that spread among the Turks that they would be destroyed by them as the Persians had been by Alexander's Macedonians."[3]

The story of Alexander the Great was, of course, a great favourite in the Greek world of Byzantium. The chord that the legend of Alexander struck in the hearts and souls of the Greeks of the Byzantine Empire is attested by considerable philological and archaeological evidence. Of particular importance is the use of images from the story on some of the most common everyday items, such as pots and jugs, which shows how popular the story was during this period, and particularly in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.[4] The epic of the Macedonian

---

11 n. 1; D.J.A. Ross *Studies* (n. 14 supra) 315–405; id., *Alexander Historiatus* (n. 11 supra); R.S. Loomis, "Alexander the Great's celestial journey" *The Burlington Magazine* 32 no. 178 (January–June 1918) 136–40. For the illustration of the tomb of Alexander the Great as depicted in two Serbian illuminated manuscripts see S. Ćurčić, "Alexander's Tomb: A Column or a Tower? A Fourteenth-Century Case of Verbal Confusion and Visual Interpretation" *To ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΟΝ. Studies in Honor of Speros Vryonis Jr.* II: *Byzantinoslavica, Armeniaca, Islamica, the Balkans and Modern Greece* ed. M.V. Anastos (New Rochelle, NY 1994) 25–48 (the main ideas contained in this paper were first presented in *BSC Abstracts* 8, Chicago 1982, 7–8). For representatioms of Alexander the Great in art see F. Pfister, "Alexander der Große in der bildenden Kunst" *Forschungen und Fortschritte* 35 (1961) 331–4; E. Hazelton Haight, ed. & trans., *The Life of Alexander of Macedon by Pseudo-Callisthenes* (New York 1955) 146–53.

1. *Koran* 18.84ff; for the other anecdote see 18.59ff.
2. F. Pfister, "Alexander der Große. Die Geschichte seines Ruhms im Lichte seiner Beinamen" *Historia* 13 (1964) 73–5; H. Badaui, "Αναφορές στις αραβικές πηγές για την καταγωγή των Μακεδόνων, του Μεγάλου Αλεξάνδρου και το θρύλο του δικέρατου" *Proceedings of the 9th Panhellenic Historical Congress (May 1988)* (Thessaloniki 1988) 13.
3. *Michael Glycas* ed. I. Bekker (Bonn 1836) 599.15–18. This can explain also the arrogance, the αὐθάδεια and θρασύτητα of the Macedonian forces; see Psellos, *Chron.* 6.110 (Renauld II 22 line 2).
4. A. Xyngopoulos, "Παραστάσεις εκ του μυθιστορήματος του Μ. Αλεξάνδρου επί βυζαντινών αγγείων" *ArchEph* (1937) 192–202; id., "Ο Μέγας Αλέξανδρος

dynasty not only grew on and contributed to the legend of Alexander the Great, but also fostered the belief that the Empire would in the end emerge victorious over its enemies, thanks to the Macedonians. It would appear that this tradition had a particular effect on the Turks, as we saw in the quotation from Michael Glykas. But on the other side of the coin, the Turks believed that the conquest of Macedonia would thus be a great and glorious feat.[1] The Arab historian Al-Maqrizi (c. 14–15) attempted to distinguish between Alexander the Great and the builder of the gate, whom he claimed was an Arab, reiterating the arguments of his predecessors.[2] The firm belief prevalent among the Turks, however, that their glory depended on their relationship with Macedonia, continued at least into the seventeenth century, as E. Brown noted in his accounts of his travels.[3]

Thus it was that within the empire of the Palaiologoi, at a time when their greatest danger came from the direction of the Turks, the hopes of all were fixed on Macedonia and the Macedonians, while at the same time the story of Alexander the Great was enjoying a surge of popularity. In fact, Alexander the Great had become so interwoven with the imagination of the people of the age that a manuscript of his story, produced in the fourteenth century and preserved in the Hellenic Institute in Venice, depicts him standing, wearing the crown and robes of a Byzantine Emperor, holding an orb in his left hand, surmounted by an inscription reading: "To Ch(rist) the L(ord) faithful king and emperor of all the East ..."[4] The Alexander of Byzantine legend had become the agent and defender of Byzantine imperial ideology, which is inseparably interwoven with the idea that God will make his faithful victorious over the unbeliever. It is interesting that, on coins dating from 326 onward, the portrait of Constantine the Great, the first Christian Emperor and the first to adopt the belief that the Christian God would protect his own by proclaiming himself 'victor',[5] closely resembles that of Alexander the Great.[6] One fourteenth-century version of the story, written in verse, which is still extant and which was reprinted by Reichmann in 1963, also describes Alexander as garbed in the purple of a Byzantine Emperor.[7] We must suppose that this metrical version circulated orally alongside the versions in prose during the whole Byzantine period but was not noted until the fourteenth century.

ἐν τῇ βυζαντινῇ ἀγγειογραφίᾳ" *EEBS* 14 (1938) 267–76, rev. F. Dölger, *BZ* 39 (1939) 556–7.

1. Vacalopoulos, op.cit. 39, 58.
2. Badaui, "Αναφορές" (n. 17 supra). See also T. Nagel, *Alexander der Große in der frühislamischen Volksliteratur* (Walldorf-Hessen 1978). Nagel tries to answer the question of just how was it possible for Alexander, the Dul-Qarnain of the Koran, to be turned into a king of Yemen.
3. E. Brown, *Relation de plusieurs voyages* (Paris 1674) 68; Vacalopoulos, op.cit. 62.
4. Xyngopoulos, "Παραστάσεις" 199; id., "Ο Μ. Αλέξανδρος" 275–6; id., *Αι μικρογραφίαι* 12, 67ff.
5. Eusebius, *VC* I.6 (Winkelmann 17.22–5); G. Rösch, *Ὄνομα βασιλείας. Studien zum offiziellen Gebrauch der Kaisertitel in spätantiker und byzantischer Zeit* (Vienna 1978) 45–6.
6. K. Wessel & G. Prinzing, "Alexander der Große in Kunst und Literatur" *LMA* I 354.
7. S. Reichmann, *Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ βασιλεύς. Das byzantinische Alexandergedicht nach dem Codex Marcianus 408* (Meisenheim am Glan 1963).

As has already been said, Alexander the Great had become a tremendously popular folk hero throughout the medieval world. The widespread popularity of the story in Byzantium, especially during the Palaiologan era, when the Empire had shrunk to the dimensions of its Greek territory and its citizens were mainly Greeks, is largely due to the fact that the Greeks considered Alexander one of their own, since for the Byzantines the fact that the Macedonians were Greeks was just as obvious as the fact that they themselves were descended from the Greeks of antiquity. And, as was noted earlier, through the translations of the romance the whole world was told that Alexander was Greek.

The Greek metrical version of the story, which would have been the best known, repeatedly refers to Alexander as Greek:

"But Alexander was a Greek, and of the race of the Hellenes" (2745)

"The pride of Macedonia and the glory of the Hellenes" (6002)

Furthermore Macedonia is described as part of Greece (688–9): "Nectanebo being king of Egypt was buried in Greece, in Macedonian soil," while in another place Greece is specified as Alexander's native land: in lines 4535–6 Porus, the king of India, says of Alexander: "I advise you, nay, I enjoin you, to return to your native land of Greece," and in lines 4542–4: "And do not appear strong being weak. Although we have need of Greece — your homeland — the Indians were still the first to be defeated by Xerxes." When Alexander dies, the wish of the Macedonians is to carry his corpse "into Greece, the land of his fathers" (6063–5).[1] This may explain the many references to the ancient Macedonians in Palaiologan literature. A complete compilation of these references has been prepared by A. Karathanassis; in this paper I shall limit myself to a few typical examples.

During the course of the siege of Thessaloniki (1383–87), the governor of the city, who happened to be the son of the Emperor John V and who was later to reign as Manuel II Palaiologos, tried to persuade the people not to surrender their city, reminding them that "we are Romans, because yours is the land of Philip and Alexander". He went on to remind them they were Romans (from the seventh century the term 'Roman' became identical with the term 'Greek', as a recent study by Stavros Kourousis has demonstrated,[2] that they were descendants of Philip and Alexander, that it was the destiny of the children of the Macedonians always to be

1. It is also clear that the Macedonians were considered Greeks and were associated with Greece: Oxyderces advised Darius to summon all the nations under his rule and prepare a joint defence "against the Macedonian Greeks" (2975ff). In line 3175 the Macedonians are again described as Greeks: "for he had an intrepid army of Macedonians, Greek men armed and strong in battle". The terms imposed by Alexander after his victory over the Persians protect the interests of the Greeks: "so that the Greeks may enter Persia without fear and trade freely in the goods which they require" (3967–8); while the battle against Porus, the Indian monarch, is described as a battle between Greeks and Indians alone (4567–9, 4672–3). Passing through the land of Candace, Alexander remarked on the mountains and the trees, comparing them with those familiar to the Greeks: "not like those in Greece, but a strange marvel" (5200, cf. 5271).
2. S.I. Kourouses, "Ἑλληνικὴ παιδεία καὶ ἐθνικὴ συνείδησις τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχαιότητος εἰς τὸ Βυζάντιον" (Athens 1993) 49.

victorious whatever the force sent against them, and that just as dust cannot withstand the rush of wind nor can a candle withstand flame, so their enemies would never be able to hold out against them.[1] A few years later, in 1345 Demetrios Kydones wrote to John VI Kantakouzenos, encouraging him to march against the enemy: "For the very name of Macedonia inspires terror in the hearts of the barbarians who remember Alexander and the handful of Macedonians who swept through Asia with him. Show them, O King, that you are Macedonians, and that only the age distinguishes you from Alexander."[2]

This brief review shows that the reference to the Macedonians of Alexander the Great and the identification of the Greeks of antiquity with the citizens of the Palaiologan Empire — so evident in our sources — was more than just a figure of speech devised by some antiquarian; rather, it was a solid argument, the product of concepts and beliefs shaped and preserved by the centuries.

But while the identification of the Greeks of the Palaiologan Empire with the Greeks of Alexander the Great demonstrates the continuity of historic consciousness among the Greeks of Byzantium, the attempt to revive the name 'Hellene' appears to have been restricted to a narrow circle of scholars and men of letters. I have dealt with this question of historical continuity elsewhere.[3] N. Svoronos has already demonstrated that the term 'Hellene' was used in a national context as early as the tenth century,[4] and a more recent study cites examples from as much as three centuries earlier.[5] The phrase "revival of the name of Hellene" thus refers to its wider use beyond the narrow confines of academia and, in my opinion, particularly among unionist scholars who seem to have accepted not only the religious but also the political position of the Pope: it was the Pope who initiated discussions of the correct designation of the Byzantines, referring to the Byzantine Emperor as the *Emperor of the Hellenes* and not *Emperor of the Romans*.[6] I supported my argument with the example of the historian Laonikos Chalkokondyles, who systematically used the name 'Hellene' for the Byzantines and 'Roman' for Westerners. Chalkokondyles was pro-Western, and in his historical writings used and accepted the erroneous papal argument of the Donation of Constantine, viz, that when the seat of the Empire was transferred to Constantinople the Pope acquired authority over the West.[7] To this example I can now add the example of the equally pro-Western Barlaam, who also accepted the

1. B. Laourdas, "'Ο 'Συμβουλευτικὸς πρὸς τοὺς Θεσσαλονικεῖς' τοῦ Μανουὴλ Παλαιολόγου" *Makedonika* 3 (1953–5) 297.21–22.
2. Kydones Ep. 8.28–31 (Loenertz I 35).
3. *Β΄ Διεθνές Συμπόσιο Αριστοτέλειου Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης: Η Μακεδονία κατά την εποχή των Παλαιολόγων. Θεσσαλονίκη, 14–20 Δεκεμβρίου 1992* (in press).
4. N. Svoronos, "Η ελληνική ιδέα στη βυζαντινή αυτοκρατορία" *Επίσημοι λόγοι του πανεπιστημίου Αθηνών* 20 (Athens 1975–76) 331–43.
5. See Kourouses (n. 28 supra) and my paper (n. 31 supra).
6. Liutprand of Cremona, *Relatio de legatione Constantinopolitana* ed. I. Bekker (Hannover-Leipzig 1915) ch. 47.
7. Chalk. I 4.3–16.

Donation of Constantine and concluded that the Bishop of Rome owed his privileged place in the Church not to succession from Peter but to the Emperor Constantine — a clear allusion to the Donation of Constantine.[1] It is interesting to observe that the same manuscript (Marc. 408) which contains the metrical version of the story of Alexander the Great published by Reichmann, also contains a text of the Donation of Constantine: "A Chrysobull and Act of Constantine, first monarch of Christendom, to His Holiness Pope Sylvester of Rome, together with his successors, that they are to be held in honour",[2] which shows that interest in this papal argument had been rekindled in the fourteenth century. This may explain why the attempt to generalise the appellation 'Hellene' appeared so suspicious in the eyes of the Byzantine Greeks. The Byzantines called themselves Romans not because they believed themselves to be Romans or to be descended from the Romans but because they considered themselves to be the only heirs of the Roman Empire; any argument limiting the universality of their Empire was therefore at the very least questionable.

If however the term 'Greek' did not come into such general use as to constitute the official appellation of the Byzantines, it did nevertheless enjoy wider use than that confined to literary circles, as is indicated by popular poetry and, as I have recently argued elsewhere, by modern Greek traditions about the 'old Greeks'.[3] These traditions do not, I think, refer only to the Greeks of antiquity but also to Byzantines, whom modern Greeks have always considered Hellenes (just as they have always considered Byzantine history part of Hellenic history).

An examination of the Alexander romance reinforces this hypothesis. As we have already noted, the historical facts about Alexander soon faded, became distorted or were even completely forgotten and a great collection of myths was created around Alexander's name as a result of the exuberance of popular imagination. Alexander was transformed into a legendary hero who brought together a number of features of mythical figures from both earlier and more recent times, including the Byzantine period.[4] In the collection by J. Kakridis,[5] for instance, there is a story where the 'old Hellenes' are described as tall, well-built and strong, with long beards, possessing great herds of sheep, goats and cattle. The reference to the extraordinarily long beards and moustaches of the old Hellenes can correspond, I believe, only to the Byzantines and is due to descriptions in hagiographic texts or perhaps on Byzantine coins and more precisely on coins of

1. F. Dvornik, *The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew* (Cambridge, MA 1958) 294–5.
2. S. Reichmann (n. 28 supra), "Introduction" ii: Θέσπισμα χρυσοβούλλειον καὶ νόμος Κωνσταντίνου, τοῦ πρώτου τῶν Χριστιανών μεγίστου βασιλέως, πρὸς πάπαν τὸν θειότατον Σίλβεστρον τὸν τῆς Ρώμης σὺν διαδόχοις τοῖς αὐτοῦ, πῶς δεῖ τιμᾶσθαι τούτους.
3. See my paper (n. 31 supra).
4. See R. Merkelbach, *Die Quellen des griechischen Alexanderromans* (2nd ed., Munich 1977).
5. I.Th. Kakrides, *Οι αρχαίοι Έλληνες στη νεοελληνική παράδοση* (Athens 1989) 30.

Heraclius and Constans II, who are each depicted with an extraordinarily long beard. On the other hand, the statement that the 'old Hellenes' had many sheep and goats is likely to be linked to the great development of stockbreeding in Byzantium.[1]

In the Byzantine period allusions to the might and the achievements of the ancient Greeks also refer — in my opinion — to the stories and the songs about the *Akrites*, the Byzantine border guards who took their name from the Greek word for 'limit'; to the tales of Byzantine historiography in which Byzantine leaders are compared to ancient Greek heroes; and also to the tales in Macedonian historiography about Basil I, the founder of the Macedonian dynasty. In these stories, which as we have seen claim that he was descended from Alexander the Great, Basil I is presented as a man of exceptional might and bodily strength; in fact, the accounts of his life are generally embellished with details which would have been familiar to ancient Greeks and are also familiar to the contemporary reader of popular tradition. Even the description of the long beard of the old Hellenes could derive from Basil II — there is often confusion between the two Basils — who, according to Michael Psellos, had a very long, thick beard. When his beard grew thinner in old age, he would gather it around his chin so as to preserve the impression of a thick beard.[2]

The accounts of the life of Basil I, surnamed the Macedonian, could perfectly well fuel the traditions referring to the ancient Greeks, not only because the Emperor was one of the figures whom the contemporary Greeks invoked in time of trouble, but principally because the Byzantines, just like the Greeks of today, never saw the Macedonians as anything other than as Greeks: "Greeks and Macedonians are one and the same", said one Byzantine historian;[3] and, as we have seen, Byzantine folk literature presented Alexander of Macedonia as a Greek: "Alexander was a Greek, and of the race of the Hellenes".

To repeat my opening comment, the role of Macedonia has always been to serve as the bastion of Hellenism. During the Byzantine period, this role had an added weight of ideology. Thanks to its most famous son, Alexander the Great, Macedonia became a significant factor in the continuity of Hellenism and a bridge between ancient and modern Greece. The story of Alexander the Great, in both prose and verse form, was a popular favourite which nurtured generations of Byzantine Greeks, just as the *Ballad*, the *Rimada*,[4] the *Phyllada* and the *Tale of Alexander the Great*[5] have in more recent times.

---

1. See my paper (n. 31 supra).
2. Psellos, *Chron.* 1.36 (Renauld I 23 lines 12–16).
3. *George Syncellos*, ed. G. Dindorf (Bonn 1829) 496: Ἕλληνες γὰρ καὶ Μακεδόνες οἱ αὐτοί; J. Irmscher, "Der Hellenismus in Geschichtsverständnis der Byzantiner" *Soziale Probleme im Hellenismus und im römischen Reich. Akten der Konferenz (Liblice, 10–13 October 1972)* (Prague 1973) 46.
4. D. Holton, *Διήγησις του Αλεξάνδρου. The Tale of Alexander. The rhymed version. Critical edition with an introduction and commentary* (Thessaloniki 1974).
5. G. Veloudis, *Η Φυλλάδα του Μεγαλέξανδρου. Διήγησις Αλεξάνδρου του Μακεδόνος* (Athens 1989).

Athanasios Karathanassis

Philip and Alexander of Macedon in the literature of the Palaiologan era

The agony of Hellenism after the Turkish invasion of Asia Minor, followed by the occupation of parts of Greece by the crusaders of Western Europe, revived memories of Philip and Alexander the Great in Greek consciousness. An examination of the numerous references to these Macedonian kings in the works of Byzantine authors is worthwhile. The period after 1204, the so-called Palaiologan era, was crucial for the destiny of Byzantium, the Greek medieval empire, and the presence of recollections of Philip and Alexander can easily be explained by the fact that people took courage and derived strength from the glory of these Macedonian kings. Such references can also be found in the literature of the period of Turkish domination as well as in that of the tragic days of 1922.[1] After the first Turkish occupation of Asia Minor the Greeks considered Alexander a saint, a founder of monasteries and the first Christian king.[2] Philip and Alexander lived on in the minds and consciousness of princes, kings and people, especially those whose origins were Macedonian. The famous Φυλλάδα του Μεγάλου Αλεξάνδρου was the best-loved romance of the people who lived in the Byzantine period and afterwards during the Turkish occupation.

This interest in Philip and Alexander can be related not only to the revival of classical learning in this period, but also to Byzantine studies of the classical Greek world after the year 1204 which found a harmony between Greek and Christian traditions and brought about a synthesis between the Christian and the ancient Greek world in Byzantine ideology. In this period we can notice the admiration for the ancient Greek spirit in the kings of Nicaea, the ideology of national wholeness, the awakening of national consciousness and the revival of the national adjective 'Hellenic' which are all elements related to the famous heroes of antiquity, Philip and Alexander. Niketas Choniates appreciated the struggles of the emperor of Nicaea, Theodore I Laskaris, and the duke of Epirus, Theodore Komnenos Doukas, and compared them to Alexander.[3] Theodore Laskaris' letters demonstrate this relationship which leads directly to the 'Great Idea' of Hellenism, expressed in the hope among Greeks of seeing their country expand and liberate their brothers who

---

1. See George Seferis, "Μυθιστόρημα" Δ:
   Δυστυχισμένες γυναῖκες κάποτε μὲ ὀλυλυγμούς
   κλαίγανε τὰ χαμένα τους παιδιά
   κι' ἄλλες ἀγριεμένες γύρευαν τὸ Μεγαλέξαντρο
   καὶ δόξες στὰ βάθη τῆς 'Ασίας.
2. The English chronicler Walter Vinsauf, for example, recorded a tradition circulating in Philippoupolis to this effect. See A.E. Vakalopoulos, *Ἱστορία τοῦ Νέου Ἑλληνισμοῦ* (Thessaloniki 1964) I 53 n. 6 = *Origins of the Greek Nation 1204-1461* tr. I. Moles (New Brunswick, NJ 1970) 23.
3. Sathas, *MB* I 122, 131.

Byzantine Macedonia. Identity Image and History. Edited by John Burke & Roger Scott (*Byzantina Australiensia* 13, Melbourne 2000).

were the slaves of Turks and Westerners.[1] This movement gathered momentum during the Palaiologan era and this same relationship is found in the consciousness of such Byzantine scholars as Nikephoros Gregoras, Nicholas Kabasilas, Demetrios Kydones and others who used elements of pre-Christian history even when they wanted to glorify saints such as St. Demetrios. Nikephoros Gregoras, for example, did not hesitate to compare St. Demetrios to Alexander.[2]

The memory of Philip and Alexander has always been present to some degree in the national consciousness of Macedonians. Philip and Alexander's struggles and victories strike a chord in the hearts of the Greek people and are proffered as worthy examples by scholars and political leaders, especially those who are Macedonian. In a very characteristic letter, dated to Autumn 1345, Demetrios Kydones, who was born in Thessaloniki in about 1324, wrote to John VI Kantakouzenos that "here in Macedonia we have big cities, an army capable of beating the barbarians; one can admire our laws and the works of our kings, our monuments and our tradition, which we must protect. It is still only the name of Macedonia that terrifies barbarians, especially when they recall Alexander and the few Macedonians who once occupied Asia."[3] In other letters to John, Kydones compared him to Alexander and recalled the story of Alexander and the musician Timotheos.[4] Referring to the bravery of the Macedonian he wrote: "The Macedonian takes his arms and seeks the enemy, and nobody can stop him once he becomes angry."[5] In the autumn of 1371 Kydones wrote to Emmanuel Kantakouzenos about how he remembered the glory of Hellenism of Alexander's time and his victorious struggles against the Persians and included an historical outline of Alexander's life.[6] Also in autumn 1371 he wrote to his student Manuel Palaiologos who was then governor of Thessaloniki and who was later to become emperor, about how his "fellow citizens, Macedonians", were bewailing the fact that Manuel had left Thessaloniki.[7] In another letter to Manuel, dated between 1373 and 1376 after Manuel's flight from Thessaloniki,[8] Kydones asked God to help Manuel

---

1. J.B. Papadopoulos, *Théodore II Lascaris, empereur de Nicée* (Paris 1908) 56–7.
2. B. Laourdas, "Βυζαντινά καί μεταβυζαντινά ἐγκώμια εἰς τόν ἅγιον Δημήτριον" *Makedonika* 4 (1960) 84, 142–3.
3. Kydones Ep. 8 (Loenertz I 35) The passage concerning Macedonia (lines 25-31) is as follows: ἐνταῦθα γὰρ καὶ πόλεις μεγάλαι καὶ στράτευμα πολὺ καὶ τέρπειν εἰωθὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους, καὶ νόμοι καὶ λόγων ἀγῶνες ἱκανοὶ βασιλέων ἔργα θαυμάζειν, καὶ ἱερὰ πάντα σεμνὰ καὶ δίκαια περισώζεσθαι, ἀλλὰ γὰρ Μακεδονίας καὶ τοὔνομα μόνον φρίκην ἐμποιεῖ τοῖς βαρβάροις Ἀλέξανδρον ἐνθυμουμένοις καὶ Μακεδόνων τοὺς ὀλίγους τοὺς σὺν ἐκείνῳ στέξαντας τὴν Ἀσίαν. Δεῖξον τοίνυν ἐκείνοις, ὦ βασιλεῦ, ὡς εἰσὶ καὶ Μακεδόνες, καὶ βασιλεὺς Ἀλεξάνδρου μόνῳ διαφέρων τῷ χρόνῳ.
4. Ep. 16 line 14 (Loenertz I 44).
5. Ep.16.26–7 (Loenertz I 44–5): ὁ δὲ Μακεδὼν ἁρπάζει τὰ ὅπλα καὶ τοὺς πολεμίους ζητεῖ, καὶ τὸν θυμὸν οὐχ οἷός τε κατέχειν ἅπαξ κεκινημένον.
6. Ep. 22.20b2 (Loenertz I 51).
7. Ep. 21.15–21 (Loenertz I 50).
8. See A.E. Karathanassis, "Ξαναδιαβάζοντας τὴν ἀλληλογραφία Δημ. Κυδώνη καὶ Μανουὴλ Παλαιολόγου (1382–1387) — Ἡ Θεσσαλονίκη

and give him good luck like the good luck of Alexander in his military enterprises.[1] Kydones' love for Alexander can also be seen in a letter to another student, the distinguished Thessalonian Radenos who after leaving Constantinople settled in Thessaloniki where he could feel protected by the arms of Macedonia. In this period, one of cultural reformation in Greece and especially Thessaloniki with the Hesychast movement, Thessaloniki became the centre of the arts and culture, the new Athens,[2] the capital city of Greece according to this Byzantine author.[3] The same scholar considered the inhabitants of Thessaloniki to be Greeks and the children of Greece.[4]

The abiding consciousness of Hellenism, which is so important for Modern Greeks, was expressed very clearly by Manuel Palaiologos while he was still governor in a speech he made in Thessaloniki when its inhabitants were being besieged. To encourage them he reminded them of Philip and the capital city of Macedonia:[5] "You must remember," he said, "that we are Romans [i.e. Greeks] and that your country is the country where Philip and Alexander lived, so that centuries later you are their successors." At the end of his speech Manuel prompted the Thessalonians to imitate the glory and struggles of the ancient Macedonians. It is noteworthy that in this speech there appeared for the first time ever the slogan 'Liberty or Death', the slogan of the struggle of the Greek Revolution. It was to be expected that Manuel Palaiologos should express himself in this way because for Macedonians paying honour to Philip and Alexander was an attitude towards life and history. To give a few examples: Thessalonians used to learn their history by reading the Φυλλάδα του Μεγάλου Αλεξάνδρου and were looking to monuments related to Philip and Alexander such as the column of Gaius Vibius Quartus which, according to the people, was a remnant of the stable of Bucephalus.[6]

Philotheos Kokkinos, patriarch of Constantinople and a distinguished scholar of his times, chose to compare St. Demetrios to Philip, stating that the saint, Philip and Alexander shared the same origins, the same city of Thessaloniki, the same glory and the same influence on their compatriots.[7] In his speech in honour of St.

κέντρον τῆς ἀντιστάσεως κατὰ τῶν Τούρκων" *Χριστιανική Θεσσαλονίκη, ΚΒ΄ Δημήτρια: Παλαιολόγειος εποχή* · (Thessaloniki 1989) 67–86.

1. Kydones Ep. 82.65–6 (Loenertz I 116).
2. Ep. 169.5-6 (Loenertz II 40) and passim (Eps. 173, 177, 187 etc.)
3. Ep. 21.50-1 (Loenertz I 50).
4. See A.A. Angelopoulos, *Νικόλαος Καβάσιλας Χαμαετός, Ἡ ζωή καὶ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ* (Thessaloniki 1970) 16–17.
5. B. Laourdas, "'Ο 'Συμβουλευτικός πρός τούς Θεσσαλονικείς' τού Μανουήλ Παλαιολόγου" *Makedonika* 3 (1958) 290–307. I draw attention to this passage: Μνημονευτέον ὑμῖν ἐστίν ὅτι Ρωμαίοι ἐσμὲν ὅτι ἡ Φιλίππου καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου ὑμῖν ὑπάρχει πατρὶς καὶ ὡς τούτοιν τοῖν γενοῖν τοῖς διαδόχοις ὥσπερ τις κλῆρος ἔλαχε κατιὼν ἐπὶ μακροῦ διαρκής...
6. See the observations of P. Collart, *Philippes, ville de Macédoine, depuis ses origines jusqu'à la fin de l'époque romaine* (Paris 1937) 326–7.
7. D.G. Tsames, *Φιλοθέου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως τοῦ Κοκκίνου, Ἁγιολογικά ἔργα* (Thessaloniki 1968) I 33.

Gregory Palamas he recalled the struggles and victories of Alexander in both the east and the west.[1] This same patriarch, in his work on the life of St. Sabas on Mt. Athos, glorified Thessaloniki the city of Philip for its size, its scholars, its superiority, and its history, and he called it the most famous city in Thessaly and in Macedonia.[2] The same encomiastic fervour appears again in a speech for St. Isidore where Thessaloniki is referred to as "my beloved country".[3]

That so many scholars made such frequent references to Thessaloniki was due to the fact that in this period Thessaloniki was menaced by the Turks, who were the enemy of the Achaemenids, the common cause of disaster in the *Oecumenia* (Universe), and who menaced and persecuted Macedonia.[4] Theodore Metochites (1270–1332), a good observer of the situation in the Byzantine empire, frequently refers to Philip and Alexander in his essays where he discusses his anxiety over Byzantium's decline. Pondering the vanity of this world, he compares the destiny of Alexander's empire with the future of Byzantium facing the Ottoman danger.[5] On the other hand, in his encomium for St. Demetrios he glorifies Thessaloniki as a superior city, a beautiful city, the most beautiful of all European cities.[6] St. Gregory Palamas refers to Alexander the Great from the same philosophical point of view. In answer to the Christians' question of why God abandoned them, Palamas makes a comparison between the peaceful character of Alexander's conquest and that of the barbarians of Mohammed.[7] Manuel Palaiologos, in a discussion with a Muslim Persian, emphasises that Alexander conquered other nations not only through his power, wealth and piety but particularly through his patience and the desire of his soul.[8]

The heroic spirit of Alexander's conquest is also highlighted by another scholar of the Palaiologan era, Nikephoros Gregoras, a good historian and philosopher, who linked the legendary accounts of Alexander's life to the fictional romance by Pseudo-Kallisthenes. This is found in a letter of his of 1347/8 to Maximos, the abbot of the Chortaites Monastery near Thessaloniki.[9] In a letter to prince Matthaios Palaiologos about Plutarch's life of Alexander, Gregoras recalls

---

1. Op.cit. 543.
2. Op.cit. 162. See for example: Τίς γὰρ οὐκ οἴδε τὴν Φιλίππου Θεσσαλονίκην, ὅπως μὲν ἔχει μεγέθους καὶ πολιτείας, ὅπως δὲ λόγοις καὶ σοφίᾳ καὶ τῷ διὰ πάντων δοκίμῳ τὰς κατ' αὐτην ὑπερέχει πάσας, ὡς μὴ μόνον Θετταλῶν τε καὶ Μακεδόνων καὶ ὧν δηλαδὴ προκαθῆσθαι λέγετω πόλεων, ... ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν μεγίστων αὐτῶν...
3. Op.cit. 64, 333, 97.
4. Op.cit. passim.
5. See *Miscellanea philosophica et historica* ed. M.C.G. Müller & T.T. Kiessling (2nd ed., Amsterdam 1968) 413–9.
6. Op.cit.
7. A. Argyriou, *Macaire Macrès* (Paris 1986) 158.
8. See Manuel II Palaiologos, *Dialoge mit einem 'Perser'* ed. E. Trapp (Vienna 1966).
9. *Correspondance de Nicéphore Grégoras* ed. R. Guilland (Paris 1927) 159: Εἶτα Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ καθ' ὅλης νεωτερίσας Ἀσίας καὶ φιλονεικήσας μηδέν τι καταλιπεῖν ἀθέατον, μήτε πέτρας ἀποτόμους μηθ' ὑπόγεια σπήλαια, μήθ' ὑπερνέφελα ὄρη, τοὺς ἡμετέρους ἰδεῖν οὐκ ἐθάρρησεν.

Philip's exhortation to Alexander to go on because Macedonia and Thrace were too small for him.[1] The most important of Gregoras's letters is the one addressed to an empress, who must have been either Anna Palaiologina, wife of Andronikos IV Palaiologos, or Helena Kantakouzena, wife of John V Palaiologos. Gregoras reminded the empress of the range of gifts Alexander sent to his friends from Babylon and likens Alexander's love for them to the love the empress feels for her friends.[2] Likewise Gregoras repeatedly glorifies Philip, Alexander, Macedonia and Thessaloniki in his encomium on St. Demetrios.[3] The well-known scholar Joseph Kalothetos also wrote about Alexander to the chief Logothete of the empire, Nikephoros Metochites[4] and similarly Manuel Kalekas, in his work on the life of St. Athanasios, refers to Alexander's view that his friends were his only treasure in life.[5]

The memory of Alexander remained vivid in the minds of Greeks even during the Turkish occupation. For instance the traveller Angiollelo, while he was a prisoner of the Turks in the Macedonian city of Philippi in 1470, heard from Greeks many legendary accounts of Philip and Alexander, legends which still exist.[6] So too in the minds of the Greeks of today there still exists the idea of using the glorious achievements of Philip and Alexander as exemplars. The passages examined in this paper show that this is a tradition which goes back at least as far as the Byzantines in the troubled times of the Palaiologan era.

1. Op.cit. 237.
2. Op.cit. 269.
3. Ibid.
4. D.G. Tsames, *Ἰωσήφ Καλοθέτου συγγράμματα* (Thessaloniki 1980) 379, 469.
5. Loenertz, *Calécas* 229.
6. A.E. Vacalopoulos, *History of Macedonia 1354–1833* tr. P. Megann (Thessaloniki 1973) 119–112.

J.H.W.G. Liebeschuetz

The Government of the late Late Roman city with special reference to Thessaloniki

This is a collection of papers on Macedonia. This paper has as its background a thesis of much wider scope, that city government evolved in much the same way over the whole extent of the old empire — even though the timing was different in different areas. The situation at Thessaloniki is brought in as an example of a much wider development.

The paper is concerned not simply with the Late Roman or Late Greek city, but with the late Late Graeco-Roman city, that is the city after 400 and into the seventh century. The distinction is important. What is generally known as the city of Late Antiquity is the city of the fourth century, which has been classically analysed in the writings of A. H. M. Jones, culminating in the *Later Roman Empire*. More recently, Bagnall's very important *Egypt in Late Antiquity*[1] has a most informative chapter on cities. But again he is concerned mainly with the fourth century. The later Late Roman city remains very much less well understood. For from the later fifth century, roughly from the reign of Anastasius, we are in quite a different world, a world which is distinctly less 'classical' and more 'Byzantine'. In the last decade there has been a considerable amount of scholarly work to help us find our way in this environment, not least Australian work on Late Roman Chronicles and on John Malalas.[2] But as far as cities and their government are concerned, there has been no synthesis, the overall view is still missing.

In Justinian's *Code* the legislation affecting cities still includes an abundance of laws whose object is to stop the drain of men and property from the city councils into the imperial service or the Church.[3] In fact the imperial government's struggle to keep men and wealth in the councils continued beyond the publication of the Justinianic *Code* into the subsequent *Novels*.[4] This might suggest that councils continued to play a vital role in the administration of their cities, and indeed the functioning of the Empire. That impression is, however, misleading. Other laws tell a different story, that of the decline and fall of curial government. The process had already begun in the fourth century with the disappearance of the traditional civic magistrates who had been appointed by the council from its members and who, working in close cooperation with the council, had shared with it responsibility for the internal affairs of the city and the carrying out of orders of the imperial government. In the fourth century and subsequently these magistrates were replaced by officers of another type, of whom the most prominent were the *curator*

1. R.S. Bagnall, *Egypt in Late Antiquity* (Princeton 1993) 45–109.
2. Malal. tr. Jeffreys; E. Jeffreys, B. Croke & R. Scott, *Studies in John Malalas* (*ByzAus* 5, Melbourne 1990).
3. *Cod.Just.* X 32.1–67 (AD 529), 33.1–4, 35.1–3, 38.1.
4. Just. *Nov.* 38 (536), 87 (539), 101 (539).

Byzantine Macedonia. Identity Image and History. Edited by John Burke & Roger Scott (*Byzantina Australiensia* 13, Melbourne 2000).

(λογιστής), the *defensor* (ἔκδικος),[1] the corn-buyer (*sitona*, σιτώνης) and the *pater* (πατήρ).[2] While these functionaries were normally local men, locally chosen, they were in fact formally appointed by the imperial government. The most detailed information about the work of the officials comes from Egyptian papyrus documents, which show clearly that they were responsible to the provincial governor, that their instructions came from him, and it was no doubt in the governor's court that they had to justify themselves. The rise of the new type of official therefore involved not only a reduction in the importance and scope of the city councils but also a concentration of political activity in the governor's court and the provincial capital

Candidates for these offices may well have at first been nominated by the councils,[3] but they themselves were not necessarily councillors. Indeed the most prominent of them, the *defensor*, could not be. After 409 at the latest, *defensores* were chosen by a decree of bishop, clergy, *honorati*, *possessores*, and councillors, listed in that order,[4] so that the councillors were only one group, and not the most important among the electors of the secular head of the city. Towards the end of the century we hear that the *defensor* and the *curator*? (ἔφορος) of Korykos in Cilicia were to be elected by the bishop and chosen inhabitants of the city. This was an imperial reply to a petition by the bishop, clergy, landowners and inhabitants: councillors as such are not mentioned either among the petitioners nor among the electors.[5] No doubt individuals who happened to be councillors were included in both groups, but their status no longer gave them the privileged position of speaking and acting for their city. This position was now occupied by a vaguely defined group of clerical and secular notables.

From the late fifth century numerous laws show 'the notables' in a position of governing body of their city — if 'body' is the correct term to describe a group whose numbers, qualifications and range of duties are not defined. Anastasius ordered that if a city required a corn-buyer (*sitona*, σιτώνης) he should be chosen by bishop and leading landowners from officials and ex-officials.[6] In 545 Justinian ruled that bishop and leading citizens (*primates*) and landowners were to elect *pater*, *sitona*, and other officers, whose accounts would subsequently be audited once a year by bishop and leading citizens.[7] In the reign of Justinian instructions relating to civic affairs were regularly addressed to bishop and/or *defensor* and to leading citizens without any mention of council or councillors at all. For instance, every year the bishop and three 'in every way outstanding citizens' are given the

1. B.R. Rees, "The defensor civitatis in Egypt" *JJP* 6 (1952) 73–102; id., "The curator civitatis in Egypt" *JJP* 7/8 (1953–4) 83–105; A.K. Bowman, *The Town Councils of Roman Egypt* (Toronto 1971) 124–5.
2. C. Roueché, "A new inscription from Aphrodisias and the title πατὴρ τῆς πόλεως" *GRBS* 20 (1979) 173–85. The earliest dated evidence; *Cod.Just.* VIII 12 (485/6).
3. On the defensor: *Cod.Theod.* I 29.6 (387).
4. *Cod.Just.* I 55.8 (409).
5. W.M. Calder, *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua* (Manchester 1928–62) III 197A.
6. *Cod.Just.* I 4.17 (499–505).
7. Just. *Nov.* 128.16.

duty of auditing the accounts of all individuals who had the spending of public revenues.

It is the bishop who is to take the initiative against officials who demand a gratuity of more than six *solidi* for publishing an announcement from the emperor or other high official.[1] Officials of the central administration are not to command provincial cities to pull down private structures that infringe building regulations: the maintenance of public buildings and the preservation of civic spaces is the sole responsibility of bishop, *pater* (πατήρ) and *possessores*.[2] So is the enforcement of regulations governing the use of water drawn from an aqueduct. Bishop and leading citizens are even allowed to refuse to accept orders from agents of the central administration which infringe their prerogatives.[3] An inscription from Hadrianopolis in Paphlagonia (Honorias) illustrates the circumstances. A *scribo* arrives from Constantinople carrying an imperial letter by which he is authorised to take action to suppress armed followers of landowners, and which calls on local authorities to give him full support. The letter is addressed to bishop and landowners and it was published for the first time in the bishop's court.[4] Clearly this was a genuine mission sent to deal with a real problem and welcomed by the people of Hadrianopolis — otherwise the letter would not have been inscribed. But equally clearly the procedure would have given the bishop and the notables attending the meeting an opportunity to challenge the validity of the document.

Who then were these notables who joined bishop and clergy in the election of civic officials, and who assisted these officials and the bishop in running the city and safeguarding its interests? It is noteworthy that quite a number of collective terms are used to describe them, but that none of these terms is ever defined. These include πρωτεύοντες,[5] ἄνδρες δόκιμοι, *primates*, but not incidentally *principales*.[6] Sometimes the description of the leading group is more comprehensive as for instance *possessores* (κτήτορες) *et habitatores* (οἰκήτορες).[7] Again we are not given any definition of either of the terms, but the fact that the *possessores* of Antioch, Laodikeia and Seleukeia were compensated for the damage

1. *Cod.Just.* I 4.26.7.
2. *Cod.Just.* I 4.26.8–9.
3. E.g. *Cod.Just.* I 4.26.4–5.
4. D. Feissel & I. Kaygusuz, "Un mandement impérial du VIe siècle" *TM* 9 (1985) 397–419.
5. Cf. *P.Laur.* 27 (487–9) & *Stud.Pal.* XX 128; *POxy.* 1983.2–4 & *Stud.Pal.* XX 146; *Pap.Lugd.Bat.* XIII (=*P.Select*) 13.1. Whether it has a precise meaning describing a definite office is disputed. *PLRE* I 1011 s.v. 'Silvanus 5' (on Theodoret Ep. 15) and 1036 s.v. 'Strategius 9' (on *POxy.* 2779, 1983) takes it to be general term perhaps equivalent to *honoratus*. See also L. di Segni, "The involvement of local magistrates and provincial authorities in urban building in late antique Palestine and Arabia" *The Roman and Byzantine Near East: some recent archaeological research* ed. J.H. Humphrey (*JRA Suppl.* 14, Ann Arbor 1995) 312–32, who at 324 refers to a πρῶτος at Scythopolis and a πρωτεύων at Caesarea.
6. References to *principales* in *Cod.Theod.* (see Jones, *LRE* III 230 n. 42) have generally not been taken into *Cod.Just.* It looks as if *principales*, like the councils which they led, lost their position of leadership in the late Late city.
7. E.g. Just. *Nov.* 128.16.

suffered in a calamitous earthquake by the title of *illustris* suggests that they were a very select group.[1] The term *habitatores* would cover the whole range of inhabitants of a city. The fact that the 'inhabitants' are sometimes mentioned as having a role should not be taken to mean that they met in assembly and were formally asked to vote. In practice they will have been given an opportunity to acclaim — or denounce — decisions taken by the notables.[2]

The lack of formal definition and the coexistence of narrower and wider descriptions suggests that we are not dealing with a permanent constitutional body of fixed composition but a *de facto* oligarchical group of laymen and clerics, who in practice decided themselves who was to belong and who was not.[3] Most cities will have included among their inhabitants a number of individuals who would have been recognised as outstanding in wealth and influence, more often than not conspicuous by their senatorial titles from 'most glorious' and 'illustrious' downwards, whether these represented actual offices, offices formerly held, or honorary rank, or had simply been assumed. They would include retired members of the central or provincial administration, ex-army officers and leading landowners. Some of these will have long had the right to sit with the provincial governor during sessions of his court, others will have attended regularly by invitation.[4] Such men would have constituted the leading citizens, and they would have arranged elections and made other decisions needed for the administration of the city. Who issued invitations to assemble the notables, and thus also decided who was to be invited, probably differed from city to city, depending on local circumstances. In a provincial capital the initiative might most often have been taken by the provincial governor. Elsewhere the convener might have been the bishop. At least that is what we would deduce from Justinian's legislation. In the *Novels* the bishop is almost treated as the chairman of the notables and the regular head of the city.[5] But in Egypt, about which we have by far the most information, the bishops of cities other than Alexandria seem to have played a comparatively small part in municipal affairs. Also elsewhere in the East the evidence for bishops becoming involved in routine secular affairs is very limited.[6] It is only in emergencies of crop failure or invasion that the bishop comes to the forefront.[7] Normally the convener and chairman probably was the *defensor* or the *pater* or another of the principal magistrates, particularly if the official was a member or

1. Malal. 18.444 (Jeffreys 258).
2. Cf. also G. Fasioli, *Dalla civitas al commune nell'Italia Settentrionale* (Bologna 1969) 46–8, 70–6.
3. The five *primates (summates)* of Alexandria in *Cod.Theod.* XII 1.190 (436) cf. *Cod.Just.* XI 29.1 may be a survival of an older arrangement.
4. Lib. *Or.* 51, 52.
5. E.g. Just. *Nov.* 128.4, 16, 17, 23. He is also encouraged to report on wrong-doing by imperial officials.
6. A. Avramea, "Les constructions profanes de l'évêque dans l'épigraphie Grecque" *Actes du XIe Congrés International d'Archéologie Chrétienne* I (Rome 1989) 829–35; D. Feissel, "L'évêque, titres et fonctions d'après les inscriptions jusqu'au VIIe siècle" ibid. 801–28.
7. D. Claude, *Die byzantinische Stadt im 6 Jahrhundert* (Munich 1969) 123–35.

dependent of a powerful local family like the Apions of Oxyrhynchus and Heracleopolis.[1]

I know only one account of an episode involving notables where we are given some personal details of the men concerned. This was the occasion when a jury of sixteen laymen was summoned at Mopsuestia in AD 550: together with the same number of clerics, they were to confirm that Theodore of Mopsuestia had never been entered on the diptychs of the church of that city.[2] This list starts with two *clarissimi*, and includes altogether seven men with imperial rank. Only one is described as a decurion and a *principalis*. Some or all of the remaining six could, I suppose, have been decurions, but they are not described as such. Members of this particular group had been presumably selected from the more elderly notables, because they were being asked to give evidence about the past. So this composition was probably not typical. Other meetings of *possessores* and *habitatores* were no doubt chosen by other criteria as appropriate to the occasion. In the case of the Mopsuestia group the summons came from the bishop. Selection of the laymen had been made by the *defensor*.

The jury of notables that made the affirmation concerning the status of Theodore of Mopsuestia was a small and select group. If a more representative expression of opinion was required this was probably achieved by giving the inhabitants of the city an opportunity to express agreement or dissent from the decision of the group by means of, as the case might be, acclamation or protest. This kind of procedure was altogether characteristic of the time. It was laid down that bishops must be elected by clergy and laity and that a bishop was needed to consecrate a bishop. But it was nowhere defined what bishops, or what members of the clergy precisely, or what laymen, were entitled to have a say in the election of a particular bishop. In practice the election was normally made by the archbishop, with a group of local clergy, and approved by acclamation of the local laity. Sometimes no doubt lay opinion or, in the case of an important see, the voice of the emperor would have a decisive say. The same lack of definition is found in St. Benedict's rule for the election of an abbot.[3] The abbot may be elected by the whole congregation of monks. But election by even a fraction of the house might be valid if they have made a 'sounder choice' (*saniore ratione*). But if vicious monks should elect an abbot of similar character the election might be overruled by the diocesan bishop, by other abbots or by neighbouring laymen. So, too, I would imagine in the cities. Normally local officials and committees were coopted by a ruling group. They could however be overruled by the provincial governor or some higher official or even the emperor. I would suggest that the absence of constitutional definition is characteristic of the political culture of this late period

1. See appendix in J. Gascou, "Les grands domaines, la cité et l'état en Égypte byzantine" *TM* 9 (1985) 1–90.
2. Mansi IX 278–89; G. Dagron, "Two Documents Concerning Mid-Sixth-Century Mopsuestia", *Charanis Studies* 9–30, rp. *La romanité chrétienne en Orient* (London 1984) 6.
3. Benedicti regula 64.

which is very different from the sophisticated constitutionalism of the classical city.

From government by curiales to government by notables.

It is clear that the loss of control by the councils was a gradual process. A plausible explanation of the development was given by Libanius towards the end of the fourth century. The maintenance of curial strength depended essentially on the *curiales* themselves. If they did not keep their colleagues to their duties nobody could. But the most powerful councillors did not mind their colleagues' departure for it meant that they could concentrate power in their own hands.[1] The consideration that they would also have to bear a larger share of the financial burdens ceased to carry much weight as the civic services which councillors had paid to provide, that is public buildings, banquets, spectacles, and competitions came to be valued less, or were financed in different ways. On the other hand there was little reason why an ordinary decurion should want to remain in his council. If he was well connected he was likely to win more wealth and esteem in the imperial service or the church. In any case he was likely to enjoy a more carefree life outside the council. Councillors were at risk of being beaten or bankrupted, and this risk was no longer compensated by the prospect of high esteem in the city. So they left.

The government did its utmost right up to the reign of Justinian to stop this trend through legislation,[2] but to little effect. In the East the notables were already in control by the reign of Anastasius. The government recognised the situation, and new legislation took account of this fact. This may well have been an important factor in the Justinianic revival.[3] In the West the process may have taken a little longer but the outcome was the same: the government had to find ways of raising the resources it needed in peace or war through agencies other than decurions,[4] and perhaps in the seventh century gave up collecting the basic land-tax altogether.[5] It is nevertheless possible to isolate the point of time when the process was complete. In an oration of 514–15 the orator Priscian praised the emperor Anastasius for lightening the tax-burden of the peasantry in consequence of all the *curiae* having abandoned their perverse habits.[6] Malalas writing in the reign of Justinian is more definite. Marinus, praetorian prefect 512–15, 'dismissed all members of the city councils and in their place created the *vindices*, as they are known in each city of the Roman state.'[7] Writing around 555 John Lydus suggests that the councils have

1. Lib. *Or.* 49.8–11, cf. 48.37–41.
2. W. Schubert, "Die rechtliche Sonderstellung der Dekurionen Kurialen in der Kaisergesetzgebung des 4–6 Jh." *ZSavRom* 86 (1969) 287–333.
3. Cf below 126–7.
4. Merovingian Gaul: R. Kaiser, "Steuer und Zoll in der Merowinger Zeit" *Francia* 7 (1979) 1–18; W. Goffart, "Old and new in Merovingian taxation" *P&P* 96 (1982) 3–21. Visigothic Spain: E.A. Thompson, *The Goths in Spain* (Oxford 1969) 99–100, 215–6.
5. Goffart, loc.cit.
6. Priscian, *In praise of Anastasius* 194, ed. A. Chauvot, *Procope de Gaza, Priscien de Caesarée, panégyriques de l'empereur Anastase I* (Bonn 1986) 64.
7. Malal. 16.400 (Jeffreys 225).

ceased to exist and that their long history as ruling assemblies of cities came to an end when Anastasius established the new office of *Vindex*.[1] A generation or so later the ecclesiastical historian Evagrius gives the impression that decurions have long ceased to exist. He confirms the testimony of Lydus and Malalas by stating that *vindices* had replaced councillors in the collection of taxes.[2] So the end of curial government, indeed of the *curiae* themselves, in the reign of Anastasius seems to be well authenticated.

The testimony of these authors can nevertheless not be altogether right. Among the 68 laws of *Cod. Just.* X. 32, laws 33–4 and 35–53 are all concerned to ensure that individuals, and if not individuals then their descendants, or at least their property, remain available to perform curial duties, or at least meet the civic expenditure for which *curiales* were liable. While many of the laws date from the fourth century, legislation in this field was still issued by Anastasius and Justinian.[3] There can be no doubt that these emperors, and particularly Justinian, thought that the preservation of the numbers, and even more of the financial strength, of the councils remained essential for the well-being of cities and empire. So Malalas, Lydus and Evagrius certainly exaggerate. But they can scarcely be totally wrong. A plausible compromise, and one consistent with the way cities seem to have been administered in the sixth century, would be that Anastasius and Marinus did deprive councils of the collective responsibility for the administration of their cities, and also of the special responsibility for the collection of the imperial taxes. But this certainly left the remaining councillors with a hereditary liability to perform certain *munera* of an unpleasant and expensive kind, so that even Jews, Samaritans, Montanists and other heretics who were excluded from all public honours[4] were not by any means to be exempted from the obligations of decurions.[5] The relevant burdens could be either personal or financial. It is however likely that financial burdens predominated since a law of 539 suggests that curial charges were becoming a servitude on property, so that men who acquired curial property *ipso facto* became decurions.[6]

The Notables at Thessaloniki

We learn quite a lot about the government of Thessaloniki in the decades on either side of 600 AD from the two oldest collections of miracles of St. Demetrios, edited, translated and commented on by Paul Lemerle.[7] Thessaloniki was of course an important centre of imperial administration, being the headquarters of the

1. J. Lydus, *De Mag.* 3.49, ed. A.C. Bandy (Philadelphia 1983) 208; cf. ibid. 1.28 (Bandy 44).
2. *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius with the Scholia* ed J. Bidez & C. Parmentier (London 1898, rp. Amsterdam 1964) 3.42.
3. *Cod.Just.* X 32.66 (497–9), 67 (529), 35.3 (528); Just. *Nov.* 38 (536), 87 (539), 101 (539).
4. Just. *Nov.* 37.5–7 (535).
5. Just. *Nov.* 45 *praef.* (537).
6. Just. *Nov.* 87(536), 101 (539).
7. Lemerle, *Miracles.*

praetorian prefect of Illyricum.[1] Among the leading inhabitants of the city there must have been a large number of imperial officials, not to mention former officials and officers, and men of honorary official rank. There was also a garrison and no doubt a garrison commander. The size of the population is quite uncertain, but was perhaps not very large.[2]

The inhabitants of the city had significant political weight vis-à-vis the imperial administration because their active contribution was needed to defend the walls against the assaults of the Sclavenes which were frequent and dangerous. The scale of popular participation in the defence of the city is shown by the quick-witted stratagem of an unnamed official. One night while a large congregation was attending a service in the church of St. Demetrios it appeared that the shrine was on fire. The official was immediately worried that in the ensuing confusion the treasures of the shrine would be pillaged. So he made the announcement that the city was about to be attacked by the Sclavenes. Everybody left the church to man the walls. The fire was put out and the treasure remained intact. It then turned out that the city was indeed under attack and the whole incident was thought to have been initiated by St. Demetrios in order to get the citizens out of church and out of bed and on to the wall to defend his city.[3] That the population should actively defend the city was evidently routine, and the inhabitants were lightly armed to make it possible. Among the civilian defenders were slaves of leading officials who had received military training.[4] The fact that it had an armed population must have given sixth century Thessaloniki significantly more independence vis-à-vis the imperial authorities than was enjoyed by the cities of earlier periods.

We are told something, but not very much, of the city's institutions of civic self government. When the emperor wanted a Sclavene king resident in the area arrested he notified the prefect and the prefect gave orders to the authorities of the city. The authorities, evidently with some reluctance, arrested the king and sent him to Constantinople. This was the beginning of a long series of troubles for the city.[5] City authorities were responsible for granaries where a great amount of publicly owned corn, presumably derived from taxation, was stored. We hear that the local notables abused their authority making use of an opportunity to sell the corn at an unusually favourable price at a time when Thessaloniki was threatened with siege by the Sclavenes. The siege duly happened and the city was reduced to famine. The local authorities dared not appeal to the emperor for supplies in case their wrong-

1. As Illyricum was gradually lost to the Sclavenes (*Miracles* 2.2 refers to the loss of Naissa and Serdica c.614), the prefect became less important, and the city seems to have been without a regular garrison, and left more or less to its own resources. So we find it considerably more independent in the anonymous collection than in that of bishop John.
2. At *Miracles* 2.4.281 (Lemerle I 221) the emperor sends 60,000 *modii* of corn to relieve famine caused by siege. The author comments that 5,000 would have sufficed. Now 5,000 *modii* might have fed 319 persons for one year (Bagnall, *Egypt in Late Antiquity* 70) or even only 111 (Jones, *LRE* 698); 60,000 *modii* would thus have fed 3,828 or only 1,333.
3. *Miracles* 1.12.
4. *Miracles* 1.13.
5. *Miracles* 2.4.

doing was revealed. Instead they ordered the requisitioning of corn from private houses and this was carried out with much violence and brutality.[1] The same authorities also sent ships to buy corn from Sclavenes settled in neighbouring areas of Greece who were at peace with the city.[2]

Who were these 'authorities'? They are never defined. The text describes them as 'those governing' (οἱ κρατοῦντες),[3] or as those holding the first positions (οἱ τὰ πρῶτα φέροντες),[4] and in one passage the 'outstanding men among the first'(οἱ ἔξοχοι τῶν πρώτων).[5] It looks as if Thessaloniki was administered by just such an undefined group of notables as we have found elsewhere. What kind of men made up this group? We can only guess. The individuals picked out for mention in *The Miracles*, mostly because they had been chosen by the saint for a significant communication, were usually higher officials and ex officials.[6] We are also told of an obviously wealthy individual man who gave sixty pounds of silver for the restoration of the shrine of St. Demetrios, and an ex-advocate(?) (δικολογῶν) who gave forty pounds.[7] One might conjecture that the leading group consisted of men such as these. They were presumably laymen. But in times of emergency the bishop might sometimes be seen in a leading role. An incident in 479 illustrates the circumstances. The citizens (πολῖται) were afraid that the prefect would hand their city over to Theoderic and his Goths. They rebelled, overthrew the statues of the emperor Zeno and threatened to burn the prefect's palace and to attack the prefect himself. The clergy and the office holders (οἱ ἐν ταῖς ἀξίαις) pacified the citizens and asked them to take over the defence of the city themselves. The citizens (πολῖται) formed a defence force from the inhabitants of the city. The prefect handed over the keys of the city to the bishop. Responsibility for surrendering the city, if that should become necessary, would be with him.[8] Many years later in 618 Thessaloniki was faced by a huge force of Avars reinforced by Sclavenes and Bulgars. The inhabitants were panic stricken at the prospect, but the bishop John led them on to the walls, patrolled the walls with them, and assured them of the support of St. Demetrios. The saint did not fail them. After thirty four days of siege and assault the enemy gave up the attempt to seize the city and withdrew in return for some unspecified concessions.[9] Clearly the bishop of Thessaloniki played an important role in the city. But as far as we can tell from *The Miracles of St. Demetrios* he was not in normal times the head of the city. Of course as far as this text is concerned the real head and patron of the city was St. Demetrios himself,

1. *Miracles* 2.4.244, 252 (Lemerle I 211, 213).
2. *Miracles* 2.4.254 (Lemerle I 214).
3. *Miracles* 2.4.252, 254, 281; cf. 1.14.132 (Lemerle I 146) *archontes*.
4. *Miracles* 2.1.
5. *Miracles* 2.4.231 (Lemerle I 208).
6. Individuals addressed by saint: high official in prefecture (*Miracles* 1.2.25), soldier (1.4.46–9), relative of prefect (1.10.86), official of prefecture (1.12.106), holder of illustrious rank (1.15.166).
7. *Miracles* 1.6.
8. Malch. frag. 20B.
9. *Miracles* 2.2.

who might communicate with his citizens through the bishop, but more often than not chose somebody else.

Christian inscriptions of Thessaloniki confirm some aspects of the picture of Thessaloniki given by *The Miracles*.[1] The end of civic politics is reflected by the total absence of civic inscriptions. Similarly there are no references to civic institutions like the βουλή, or to civic titles, not even to the late, semi-imperial functionaries like the *defensor* or the πατήρ. The majority of inscriptions are tombstones without any indication of rank or profession. Only two groups seem to have been quite regularly commemorated with reference to their status: former imperial officials[2] and clergy.[3] There are also a few shopkeeper–craftsmen[4] and slaves.[5] But mere civic status or civic merit is no longer commemorated.

What difference did the end of curial government make?

It has been suggested that the end of curial government did not in fact make any significant difference since 'élite' government continued much as before.[6] This I would argue is a mistake. First, the end of curial government also meant the end of government in accordance with a known and accepted constitution. It thus represents the end of the ancient tradition of constitutional politics going back to Solon of Athens and beyond, which received its classic exposition in Aristotle's *Politics*. From the point of view of the imperial government the immediate and obvious advantage of the new arrangement was that it placed the running of the cities in the hands of the men who for over a hundred years had been the most influential and wealthiest inhabitants but who had by one means or another obtained immunity from curial duties.[7] In addition the new system represented an attempt to mobilise the prestige and resources of the bishop for the benefit of the secular institutions of the city. On the other hand the reform did not simply widen the curial order, for the notables were not required to become members of a collective body, and did not acquire a hereditary obligation to perform defined civic duties and to meet defined civic expenses.[8] The imperial government was not in a position to coerce notables in the way it could still coerce decurions. The notables' public service remained voluntary. It is also important that the bishop, who, as the emperors were aware, was the natural head of the new organisation, enjoyed a kind of 'semi-detached' relationship to the secular affairs of the city. Besides the sacred

1. D. Feissel, *Recueil des inscription chrétiennes de Macédoine du IIIe au VIe siècle* (*BCH Suppl.* 8, Paris 1983).
2. Ibid. 132, 134, 146–51.
3. Ibid. 130, 133, 136–7, 138–44.
4. Ibid. 156–7. They are also found in small numbers in other Macedonian towns. Relatively they are more prominent than in the cities of earlier periods.
5. Ibid. 158–61.
6. E.g. M. Whittow, "Ruling the late Roman and early Byzantine city" *P&P* 129 (1990) 3–29.
7. Jones, *LRE* 740ff: the government's unsuccessful struggle to check this process.
8. *Cod.Just.* X 33.3 (465), 4 (528) non-decurions volunteering for particular curial expenses do not thereby acquire a hereditary obligation.

nature of his office gave him some protection from the cruder forms of pressure exerted by the imperial authorities on curial magistrates.

Government by notables blurred responsibility for the secular government of the city, and must have made it more difficult for the imperial government to get its commands obeyed. It must also have meant that there was no public body permanently responsible for the state of the city and its public buildings and streets. We know that the imperial government remained concerned that public spaces should not be infringed by private building.[1] But archaeology has shown that in many cities private building on public spaces, particularly in the colonnades of colonnaded display streets, did take place — even if the date of such building is in most cases still very uncertain.[2]

The sixth-century laws concerned with finance, whether the collection of taxes for the imperial government or the expenditure of money for civic purposes, show quite clearly that there was much greater variety of organisation under the new system than there had been under the old. A number of *Novels* have lists of functionaries who might act as tax-collectors. Decurions are mentioned but only as one of a variety of office holders who might be responsible for collection. In a law of 545 the men whose duty it would be to nominate tax-collectors (ὑποδέκται) at their own risk, formerly the duty of decurions, are simply described as 'landowners'.[3] In the same law the men who bear the risk of collection are defined as 'governors, πολιτευόμενοι (decurions), *exactores*, *vindices*, *canonicarii* and others.'[4] If the owner of an estate liable to pay taxes can not be found, or is not in a position to pay the taxes, the estate is to be handed over to other tax-payers, or as a last resort to the collectors, i.e. *exactores*,[5] *vindices* or members of the provincial *officium*.[6] A law of 556 refers to provinces in which neither *vindices* nor other functionaries bore the risk of tax-collection. In these provinces the governor would be held liable.[7] A law of Tiberius II of 575 remits taxes for one year in four. Instructions to this effect are given to collectors, i.e. 'βουλευταί, ἐκλήπτορες, *scriniarii*, ταξεῶται, ἀνυταί and other ὑποδέκται.'[8] Presumably these titles reflect different arrangements in different cities. It looks as if the government did not try to set up a uniform system of tax-collection to replace collection by the curiales, but that it made regional arrangements in accordance with local conditions.

---

1. See above n. 13.
2. H. Kennedy, "From Polis to Madina: urban change in late antique Syria" *P&P* 106 (1985) 3–27.
3. Just. *Nov.* 128.5.
4. Ibid. 5, cf. 8.
5. *Exactores* are simply the individuals who exact the taxes. In the fourth century they were normally decurions. But it should not be assumed that a functionary described as an exactor in the sixth century must be a decurion. E.g. the *exactores* who collected from the tenants of the *domus divina* in Cappadocia (Just. *Nov.* 30.3) were evidently not decurions, as these imperial estates were not attached to a city (Jones, *LRE* 713).
6. Just. *Nov.* 8.
7. Just. *Nov.* 134.2. In the 4th century the liability was the decurions'.
8. Just. *Nov.* 163.2.

As for civic finance, it is reasonably certain that the burden of liturgical expenditure which had once been born by decurions was by now much reduced. For one thing the resources of the wealthy had now to be shared between the traditional secular munificence and Christian charity, with Christian charity absorbing an ever increasing amount. As was already observed by A.H.M. Jones,[1] most remaining civic expenses seem to have been met from specifically assigned revenue. Expenses had no doubt been reduced. There was probably very little secular public building except building of fortifications, and it is likely that in many towns some of the more spectacular structures of the High Empire were allowed to decay. So the church of St. Demetrios at Thessaloniki was built on top of a public bath.[2] In *The Miracles* a disused bath-building is used to house refugees.[3]

Civic shows underwent important changes. There were fewer of them and there was less variety. Athletic games and gladiatorial shows came to an end.[4] Theatrical shows continued: the bishop of Thessaloniki felt embarrassed at being seen there — even if only in a dream.[5] Chariot racing of the Roman type, that is as a professional spectator sport, became more widespread.[6] It seems to have become the principal entertainment in larger cities, perhaps in most provincial capitals, certainly at Thessaloniki.[7] It is also significant that the finance and organisation of the shows were taken out of civic politics and transferred to the state-financed circus factions.[8] The factions duly became a factor in local politics and from time to time a cause of rioting and instability. But not at Thessaloniki, a blessing for which the citizens gave thanks to their city's supernatural patron St. Demetrios.[9]

In the short run, the new system seems to have served the government well. It provided the financial resources for the ambitious policies of Justinian, enabling that emperor to finance his buildings and his wars and to pay subsidies to the Persians and others. In the long run, the fact that it was now more difficult for the imperial administration to assign responsibility for the performance of the cities' duties to the Empire made the cities themselves less useful for the administration. That is probably one reason why after the disasters of the seventh century the recovering Empire based its administrative system in Macedonia as elsewhere not on cities but on themes.

---

1. Jones, *LRE* 737; see also my article "Civic finance in the Byzantine period: the laws and Egypt" *BZ* 89 (1996) 389–408.
2. J.-M. Spiesser, *Thessalonique et ses monuments du IVe au VIe siècle* (Paris 1984) 214.
3. *Miracles* 1.14.143.
4. Alan Cameron, *Porphyrius the Charioteer* (Oxford 1973) 228–32.
5. *Miracles* 1.14.
6. Cameron, *Circus Factions* 208ff. *POxy.* 2707: a mixed programme.
7. Prokopios, *SH* 1.11 (Haury & Wirth III 6). More generally, C.M. Roueché, *Performers and Partisans at Aphrodisias* (London 1993).
8. Cameron, *Circus Factions* 218ff.
9. *Miracles* 1.10.82 (Lemerle I 112–3).

Alkmene Stavridou-Zafraka

The development of the theme organisation in Macedonia

The evidence for the historical development of the theme organisation is sparse and lies chiefly in Constantine Porphyrogennetos' *Concerning Themes* (*Περὶ Θεμάτων*) which, although a systematic account of themes, must be treated with caution because of its sometimes contradictory information and because it sometimes reflects the administrative organisation of the state during the sixth century. Additional information may be drawn from Arab geographers, the ceremonial treatises of precedence at court, narrative sources, documents and sigillographic material.[1] Reconstruction of the historical development is not easy because there are no explicit references to the creation of themes in Byzantine sources; the existence of a theme is only alluded to in technical terms which describe divisions of the army (θέμα, τούρμα, δροῦγγος), the officers in charge of them (*strategos*, *tourmarches*, *droungarios*) or the political officials of a theme (*protonotarios*, *chartularios* etc.)[2]

The present paper is merely an attempt to present a general picture of the development of the theme organisation in the geographical area of Macedonia from the seventh to the early thirteenth centuries and to focus on some problems that need further investigation.

Themes had been established in the Balkan peninsula by the end of the seventh century mainly for defensive purposes as military units and as administrative divisions under a *strategos*.[3] According to the extant sources the theme of Thrace was created by Constantine IV between 680 and 685 in order to protect Thrace from the Bulgarians who had crossed the Danube, entered Byzantine territory and settled in the former provinces of Moesia Inferior and Scythia Minor in northeastern Thrace.[4] Sometime between 687 and 695 Justinian II created the theme of Hellas in central and southern Greece,[5] and around 688 he settled Scyths (i.e. probably Slavs who had succumbed to his authority) in the valley and mountainous reaches of the

1. *De them.* 160. Cf. Vasiliev, *History* 226; E.W. Brooks, "Arabic Lists of the Byzantine Themes" *JHS* 21 (1901) 67.
2. Cf. A. Stavridou-Zafraka, "Slav invasions and the Theme Organisation in the Balkan Peninsula" *Byzantiaka* 12 (1992) 168.
3. On the origins of the thematic system see J. Karayannopulos, *Die Entstehung der byzantinischen Themenordnung* (Munich 1958) with relevant theories and sources. See also G. Theocharides, *Ιστορία της Μακεδονίας κατά τους μέσους χρόνους (258–1354)* (Thessaloniki 1980) 203–15.
4. *De them.* 84.5–85.25f.
5. G. Ostrogorsky, "Postanak tema Hellada i Peloponnez" *ZRVI* 1 (1952) 64–77, esp. 65 (Greek translation by J. Papadrianos in *Βαλκανική Βιβλιογραφία* I: *Supplement* (Thessaloniki 1973) 205–29) with sources; P. Charanis, "Hellas in Greek sources of the Sixth, Seventh and Eighth Centuries" *Late Classical & Medieval Studies in Honor of Albert Matthias Friend, Jr.* ed. K. Weitzmann (Princeton, N.J. 1955) 173.

Byzantine Macedonia. Identity Image and History. Edited by John Burke & Roger Scott (*Byzantina Australiensia* 13, Melbourne 2000).

Strymon River against Slavonic and Bulgarian irruptions southwards. The Strymon valley served as an important route from the interior of the Balkans to the Aegean Sea, but also provided access to invaders. Thus the *kleisoura* of the Strymon River was established. A *kleisoura* was a small military division ruled by a *kleisourarch*.[1]

It is generally held that the militarization of the Empire was not all-encompassing. The civil administration was also in existence. In the Balkan peninsula for example, the prefecture of Illyricum still existed, which towards the end of the fourth century had embraced the dioceses of Dacia and Macedonia, which then included the Greek peninsula and the islands, although it had suffered losses to the Slavs who had settled in its territories. The region of Thessaloniki, which had sustained repeated attacks by the Slavs, remained under the authority of the *eparch* of Illyricum until it was formed into a theme. The *kleisoura* of the Strymon River, although theoretically included in the prefecture of Illyricum, came under the jurisdiction of the theme of Thrace.[2]

The reorganization of the provincial theme system under the Isaurian dynasty was most probably completed during the time of Leo III (717–41). Civil power was transferred into the hands of the military governor, the *strategos*, and new themes were formed by dividing the large themes of Asia Minor. The reorganisation was dictated by political considerations, namely to reduce the military power of the *strategoi* and prevent them from revolting against the emperor, and by external dangers due to Arab expansion.

New themes were created in the Balkan peninsula by the end of the eighth and the beginning of the ninth centuries. Sometime between 789 or 792 and 802 the theme of Macedonia was created out of the western regions of the theme of Thrace. It derived its name most probably from the regions of Macedonia Prima which it included, i.e. territories from the Nestos to the Strymon River.[3] The region east of the Strymon River was later detached from the theme of Macedonia and made into a new theme. Its core was the former *kleisoura* of the Strymon River. According to Constantine Porphyrogennetos: τὸ δὲ θέμα τοῦ Στρυμόνος τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ συντέτακται.[4] The theme of Strymon of his day must therefore have been a part of the theme of Macedonia. After the establishment of the theme of Strymon the name Macedonia came to designate the homonymous theme which extended from the

1. *De them.* 88–9. Cf. M. Gregoriou-Ioannidou, "Η εκστρατεία του Ιουστινιανού Β΄ κατά των Βουλγάρων και Σλάβων (688)" *Byzantiaka* 2 (1982) 113–124. For *kleisourae* see J. Ferluga, "Niže administrativne jedinice tematskog uredenja" *ZRVI* 2 (1953) 78–9; M. Gregoriou-Ioannidou, "Οι βυζαντινές κλεισούρες και κλεισουραρχίες" *Byzantiaka* 9 (1989) 181–202.
2. Theocharides, op.cit. 91ff; J. Karayannopoulos, *Το βυζαντινό διοικητικό σύστημα στα Βαλκάνια (4ος–9ος αι.)* (Athens 1994) 15–20.
3. See A. Stavridou-Zafraka, "Θεσσαλονίκη 'Πρώτη Πόλις Θετταλίας'" *Χριστιανική Θεσσαλονίκη. Γ΄ Επιστημονικό Συμπόσιο. ΚΔ΄ Δημήτρια: Από της Ιουστινιανείου εποχής έως και της Μακεδονικής δυναστείας (18–20 Οκτωβρίου 1989)* (Thessaloniki 1991) 63–77; eadem, "Slav invasions" 173ff.
4. *De them.* 88.1–2

Hebros to the Nestos River, which is in the geographical region of Thrace. Henceforth Byzantine sources refer to it as 'Macedonia of Thrace' (Μακεδονία τῆς Θράκης), or 'Macedonia near Thrace' (Μακεδονία ἡ κατὰ Θράκην), and in reference to the soldiers or the population of these two themes they usually speak of Macedonians and Thracians. The headquarters of the *strategos* of Macedonia was at Adrianople.[1]

Let us now consider the textual evidence and the divergent views that have been formulated about the themes of Macedonia as a geographical area, i.e. the themes of the Strymon River and Thessaloniki. Scholars have turned their attention first of all to the period when the theme of Strymon was created. According to P. Lemerle the theme of Strymon originated in the second half of the ninth century, because its *strategos* is not mentioned in the table of precedence known as the *Uspenskij Taktikon* (842/3).[2] The earliest textual reference to its *strategos* occurs in the treatise of Philotheos (899).[3]

But St. Kyriakides asserted that the theme was created in the first years of the ninth century, and certainly before 809, when it is recorded that Bulgarians attacked the Byzantines at the Strymon River where many Byzantine soldiers were massacred along with the *strategos* and other thematic officials. The Bulgarians also took away the money (ῥόγα) intended to be used for paying the soldiers.[4] There is a series of lead seals belonging to political or military officials of the theme which date from before the mid-ninth century. One belongs to Basil, *hypatos* and *protonotarios* of Strymon,[5] another to Leo, imperial *spatharios* and *strategos*,[6] and another to Bardas, *basilikos spatharios* and *archon* of Strymon.[7] This last seal raises the problem of *archon* and *archontia*, which I will deal with below. There are also lead seals that date from the ninth, tenth and eleventh centuries.[8] A seal of Lycastos, *basilikos protospatharios* and *strategos* of Strymon,[9] is probably to be dated to the end of the eighth or the beginning of the ninth century if the owner of

1. Cf. Stavridou-Zafraka, "Slav invasions" 176, with relevant sources and literature.
2. Lemerle, *Philippes* 126–7; *De them.* (Pertusi 166–7).
3. Oikonomides, *Listes* 101.25, 105.17, 137.19, 139.13.
4. Theoph. 484.29–485.3. Cf. St. Kyriakides, *Βυζαντιναί Μελέται* II–IV (Thessaloniki 1939) 399–400.
5. J. Nesbitt & N. Oikonomides, *Catalogue of Byzantine Lead Seals at Dumbarton Oaks and in the Fogg Museum of Art* I: *Italy, North in the Balkans, North of the Black Sea* (Washington, D.C. 1991) no. 37.2 (Zacos, *Seals* I 1772, dates the seal to the second half of the ninth century).
6. Nesbitt & Oikonomides I 37.3 (Zacos, *Seals* I 2659) indicate that it is an anonymous seal.
7. Nesbitt & Oikonomides I 37.1 (Zacos, *Seals* I 1753). Perhaps the seal belongs to the same Bardas *strategos* of Thrace: Nesbitt & Oikonomides I 71.23 (Zacos, *Seals* I 1761a) (9th century).
8. Nesbitt & Oikonomides I 37.6, 37.5, 37.7.
9. V. Laurent, "Sceaux byzantins inédits" *BZ* 33 (1933) 350. Cf. St. Kyriakides, *Βυζαντιναί Μελέται* II–IV 353–357, 400.

the seal is the same person as the homonymous correspondent of Theodore Stoudites[1] or Lycastos 'στρατηγέτης Μακεδονίας' of another lead seal.[2]

Scholarly opinion differs regarding the exact territory of the Strymon River indicated by the sources. It is usually asserted that the *kleisoura* and later the theme of Strymon included the valley and the area between the lower reaches of the Strymon and Nestos Rivers up to Melenikon, i.e. mainly in the present Greek East Macedonia.[3] But as I have pointed out in a previous paper, the *kleisoura* and later the theme of Strymon included not only the main *kleisoura* between Roupel and Melenikon but also the mountainous regions of Rhodope and Orvilos and the valley leading up to the plateau of Sofia, where the river rises. This is corroborated by the fact that the Byzantine border was not at Rhodope but extended to the southern slopes of Haimos. Also, the campaigns of the emperors at the end of the seventh and during the eighth and the beginning of the ninth centuries against the Bulgarians and the Slavs who fought with them as allies (σύμμαχοι) took place in Thrace and not in Northern Greece. I refer only to the expeditions of the emperors Justinian II in 688 and Constantine V in 758 and 763, as well as the long expedition of the official Staurakios in 783, the great disaster which befell Byzantine troops under Constantine VI at the stronghold of Markellai in 792, the expeditions of Nikephoros I in 808/9 and the thirty-year peace agreement concluded between Leo V and the Bulgarian Omurtag in 815 that defined the border between the two states in Thrace from Develtos to Makrolivada as far as the Haimos mountains.[4]

The theme of Strymon included also the area of Voleron which corresponds to the modern provinces of Xanthi and Rhodope.[5] It is not certain whether the capital of the theme was Serres or Christoupolis (modern Kavala), an important seaport and stronghold.[6] According to an inscription, the walls of the latter city had been repaired by the *strategos* of the theme of Strymon, Βασίλειος Κλάδων, in 926.[7] Seals of *kommerkiarioi* and theme officials of Christoupolis have been preserved and they prove the importance of the city as a commercial and military centre.[8]

---

1. Theod. Stoudites (ed. Fatouros) ep. 505: "Λυκάστῳ ὑπάτῳ".
2. Cf. Kyriakides, op.cit. 353–4, 400. This date is rejected by Lemerle, *Philippes* 126.
3. Lemerle, *Philippes* 125; Mila Rajković, "Oblast Strimona i tema Strimon" *ZRVI* 5 (1958) 1–7; J. Karayannopoulos, "Η επικοινωνία Θεσσαλονίκης-Κωνσταντινουπόλεως κατά τους 7ο–9ο αι." *EEPhSPTh* (1984) 215.
4. A. Stavridou-Zafraka, "Τα θέματα του μακεδονικού χώρου. Το θέμα Στρυμόνος" *ByzMak* 307–12.
5. St. Kyriakides, *Βυζαντιναί Μελέται* IV: *Το Βολερόν* 291–494; Theocharides, *Ιστορία* 231–2.
6. Lemerle, *Philippes* 128; Kyriakides, op.cit. 401; Theocharides, ibid. 227.
7. S. Reinach, "La reconstruction des murs de Cavalla au Xe siècle" *BCH* 6 (1882) 267–75. Cf. Lemerle, ibid. 141; Kyriakides, ibid. 396.
8. Seals of archontes of Christoupolis of the ninth and tenth centuries: Nesbitt & Oikonomides I 39.1 and II (*South of the Balkans, the Islands, South of Asia Minor)* 39.3. A seal of a *droungarios* of Christoupolis (9th century): I 39.4. Seals of three *kommerkiarioi*: 39.5, Zacos, *Seals* II 205.

The second theme in the geographical area of Macedonia was the theme of Thessaloniki. Its *strategos* is first mentioned anonymously in the *Vita* of St. Gregory the Decapolite (831–8)[1] and in the *Uspenskij Taktikon*.[2] The theme is probably alluded to by Emperor Michael II in his letter to Louis the Pious in 824, where he says that Thomas the Slavonian had recruited men from Thrace and Macedonia, i.e. from the respective themes, and from Thessaloniki and the surrounding Sclaviniae: "*Thraciae, Macedoniae, Thessaloniae et circumiacentibus Sclaviniis.*"[3] Thus 831 and 824 serve as *termini ante quem* for the creation of the theme.

Thessaloniki, the second city of the empire, had been the capital of the prefecture of Illyricum — ἡ ἐν τῷ Ἰλλυρικῷ μεγαλόπολις Θεσσαλονίκη,[4] as it is usually referred to by the sources. Many territories of the prefecture had been lost to the Slavs, who had settled there during the sixth and seventh centuries. The *Eparch* of Illyricum is mentioned in the *Miracles* of St. Demetrios, the patron saint of Thessaloniki, in the seventh century.[5] The ὕπαρχος mentioned by Theodore Stoudites in 796[6] was suggested by Bury to have been the *eparch* of Illyricum.[7] P. Lemerle has asserted that Illyricum had been confined to Thessaloniki itself and that the prefect of Illyricum actually became a prefect of the city, as in Constantinople.[8] Angeliki Konstantakopoulou considered the prefect a new official appointed by the government,[9] while other scholars see in his role the continuation of the *praefectus praetorio per Illyricum*.[10]

The fact is, however, that there are references in the *Miracles* of St. Demetrios which prove that already in the seventh century Slavic settlements in Macedonia near Thessaloniki, e.g. Drougoubitae and Rynchinoi, had been effectively under the control of the Byzantine Empire.[11] It would be strange indeed if a territory as important as Thessaloniki lacked power and that the prefecture of Illyricum was

---

1. F. Dvornik, *La vie de Saint Grégoire le Décapolite et les Slaves macédoniens au IXe siècle* (Paris 1926) 36.62–63.
2. *Uspensky Taktikon* (Oikonomides, *Listes* 49.16).
3. Mansi XIV 418; *MGH Leges* III Conc. T. 2 pt. 1 p. 477; *Reg* no. 408.
4. Theoph. 461.5–6.
5. Lemerle, *Miracles* I 137.16ff, *Eparchos* of Thessaloniki, 188, 208–9, 229.
6. Theod. Stoudites (ed. Fatouros) Ep. 3.106.
7. Bury, *ERE* 223–4.
8. Lemerle, *Philippes* 123; id., "Invasions et migrations dans les Balkans depuis la fin de l'époque romaine jusqu'au VIIIe siècle" *RH* 211 (1954) 271; id., *Miracles* II 173, 176. See also Theocharides, op.cit. 220; Aik. Christophilopoulou, "Βυζαντινή Μακεδονία. Σχεδίασμα για την εποχή από τα τέλη του Στ΄ μέχρι τα μέσα του Θ΄ αι." *Byzantina* 12 (1983) 9–64, 46, 51. See objections by Stavridou-Zafraka, "Slav invasions" 169–72; eadem, "Τα θέματα του μακεδονικού χώρου. Το θέμα Θεσσαλονίκης" Byzantina 19 (1998) 160–2.
9. A. Konstantakopoulou, "L'éparche de Thessalonique: Les origines d'une institution administrative (VIIe–IXe siècles)" *Greek papers submitted to the 5th International Congress of Southeastern Europe 1984* (Athens 1985) 157–62.
10. For example Karayannopoulos, *Διοικητικό Σύστημα* 16–20.
11. *Miracles* I 229, 209, 214. Cf. Stavridou-Zafraka "Slav invasions" 170.

confined to the city of Thessaloniki. The problem clearly needs further investigation.

There are several seals which belong to the *eparch* of Thessaloniki dated to the eighth and ninth centuries.[1] This suggests that he may have co-existed with the *eparch* of Illyricum and later with the *strategos* of the theme of Thessaloniki, if he had been a civil officer with responsibilities similar to those of the *eparch* of Constantinople.[2] There are also seals of *kommerkiarioi* dated to the eighth and ninth centuries and seals of other political officials of Thessaloniki that provide evidence for economic and commercial activities between the city and its hinterland.[3] There are also seals of thematic officials which belong to the eighth and ninth centuries such as those of Constantine, *hypatos* and *protonotarios* of Thessaloniki,[4] as well as the seal of a *komes tes kortes* (count of the tent) from the eighth century, "who was a kind of chief-of-staff" of the thematic *strategos*.[5] These two seals together with the fact that Byzantine sources use the term Thessaloniki both geographically and politically provide some grounds for believing that the theme of Thessaloniki had already been founded in the late eighth century before the above-mentioned dates.[6] This remains a hypothesis, however, and the evidence is insecure at present.

Many seals belonging to *strategoi* and thematic officials of the theme of Thessaloniki[7] such as *tourmarches*,[8] *protonotarioi*[9] and *chartoularioi* have been preserved as well as the seals of an *archon*[10] and an acting *strategos* 'ἐκ προσώπου Θεσσαλονίκης'[11] which belong to the ninth and tenth centuries.

Since it included the towns of Veroia (Beroea) and Servia, the theme of Thessaloniki must have extended west of the Strymon River to the Pindos mountains.

During the eighth century the theme of Cephallonia, which included the Ionian islands, was established, and at the beginning of the ninth century, probably during the reign of Nikephoros I, the theme of the Peloponnese took its final form. Sometime before 815 the theme of Dyrrachion was created. Nikopolis, which included Old Epirus, was established as a theme in the second half of the ninth

---

1. Zacos, *Seals* I 1691, 957, 2588, 2589 (Nesbitt & Oikonomides I 18.18, 18.19, 18.20, 18.22, 18.23). Cf. Christophilopoulou, op.cit. 52; Konstantakopoulou, "L'éparche de Thessalonique" 162.
2. Cf. Stavridou-Zafraka, "Slav invasions" 171.
3. Christophilopoulou, op.cit. 52–53, 54–55.
4. Nesbitt & Oikonomides I 18.53.
5. Nesbitt & Oikonomides I 18.27 and 50. Cf. Oikonomides, *Listes* 341.
6. Cf. Stavridou-Zafraka, "Slav invasions" 171–2; Nesbitt & Oikonomides I 18.27.
7. Nesbitt & Oikonomides I 18.61–77. Cf. F. Winkelmann, *Byzantinische Rang- und Ämterstruktur im 8. und 9. Jahrhundert* (Berlin 1985) 106, 126.
8. Nesbitt & Oikonomides I 18.78 (Zacos, *Seals* I 2558).
9. Nesbitt & Oikonomides I 18.54, 18.55 (Zacos, *Seals* I 2135), 18.56 (Zacos, *Seals* I 2097), 18.57–60.
10. Nesbitt & Oikonomides I 18.12, 18.13.
11. Nesbitt & Oikonomides I 18.17. Cf. Oikonomides, *Listes* 342.

century. This completed the theme system in the Balkan peninsula.[1] These themes and the themes of the Strymon River and Thessaloniki were called the western themes (i.e. west of Constantinople), and so Thessaloniki was called ἡ τῶν ἑσπερίων μήτηρ. They were not supported by the treasury but by the revenues of their respective districts.[2]

The *Escorial Taktikon* records another administrative and military reform in the tenth century (971–5), which is confirmed by narrative sources, documents and sigillographic material. Thessaloniki, like important frontier themes in the east, came under the command of a *doux*, who was provided with heavy cavalry from the regiments (*tagmata*).[3] He was ranked after the *doux* of the theme of Anatolikon in the hierarchy of theme officials. A *strategos* of Thessaloniki also appears in the *Taktikon*.[4] This means that the theme could be potentially under the command of a *strategos* or a *doux*. There are seals of an acting *strategos*[5] and from the documents of the monasteries of Lavra and Iveron we know of two 'ἐκ προσώπου Θεσσαλονίκης' who served in 974 and 975.[6]

It has been suggested that the rise of the *doux* to the supreme military command of a theme is most probably connected with the military reforms of Nikephoros II Phocas (959–63) and the increase in heavy cavalry. A change in the property rating for cavalry soldiers — a Novel of the emperor fixed the value of their lands at no less than twelve pounds of gold instead of four — meant that only the wealthy could become soldiers, or that soldiers could either be provided by joint contribution or mercenaries could be recruited instead.[7] This Novel has been questioned by T. Kolias, who has shown convincingly that cataphract cavalry was not an innovation of Nikephoros but had always existed in the Byzantine army.[8]

It seems that in the course of the tenth century large themes were divided into smaller ones and new themes were established around a city or a stronghold. The size of the theme of Thessaloniki was much reduced by the creation of the themes of

1. D. Zakythenos, "Le thème de Céphalonie et la défense de l'Occident" *HellCont* 8 (1954) 303–12; J. Ferluga, "Sur la date de la création du thème de Dyrrachium" 12 *CEB* [Ochrid 1961] 83–92, rp. *Byzantium on the Balkans* (Amsterdam 1976) 215–24; P. Soustal & J. Koder, *Nikopolis und Kephallenia* (*TIB* III, Vienna 1981).
2. *De cer.* 696–7.
3. Oikonomides, *Listes* 263.33, 354; Nesbitt & Oikonomides I 51.
4. Oikonomides, *Listes* 265.35.
5. Nesbitt & Oikonomides I 18.17. Cf. Oikonomides, *Listes* 342.
6. *Lavra* no. 6.1 (974?); *Ivir.* no. 2.1 (975).
7. See G. Ostrogorsky, *Geschichte des byzantinischen Staates* (3rd ed., Munich 1963) 239; Lemerle, *Agr. Hist.* 131, 150–1.
8. T. Kolias, *Νικηφόρος Β΄ Φωκάς (963–969): Ο στρατηγός αυτοκράτωρ και το μεταρρυθμιστικό του έργο* (Athens 1993). Cf. reviews by J.F. Haldon in *JÖB* 45 (1995) 437, M. Philippides in *Speculum* 70 (1995) 395–6, K. Panayotidis in *Byzantina* 18 (1995-6) 460–7.

Veroia, Drougoubiteia and Edessa, whose *strategoi* are also mentioned in the *Escorial Taktikon*.[1]

The theme of Veroia lay to the west of the river Axios, southwest of Thessaloniki, and also included the coast of Pieria. The theme of Drougoubiteia lay northwest of Thessaloniki and bordered on the theme of Strymon.[2] The name Drougoubiteia is reminiscent of the Slavic tribe of Drougoubitae mentioned in the *Miracles* of St. Demetrios (seventh century) and in the text of John Kameniates in the tenth century. It seems that they had been integrated into the imperial administration from a very early date and had already converted to Christianity by the ninth century since a bishop of Drougoubiteia, a suffragan to the archbishop of Thessaloniki, is known to have attended the Council of 879[3] in Constantinople.

Apart from the *Escorial Taktikon*, a seal of a *strategos* of Drougoubiteia from documents in the Iveron monastery of 995 and 996 has been preserved,[4] as well as seals of political thematic officials of the eleventh century such as the κριτὴς ἐπὶ τοῦ ἱπποδρόμου καὶ τῆς Δρουγουβιτείας and the κριτὴς τῆς Δρουγουβιτείας.[5]

Modifications of the provincial administration, however, did not prompt change in the ecclesiastical administration. The bishoprics of Veroia, Drougoubiteia and Edessa continued to be subordinate to the metropolis of Thessaloniki.[6]

The theme of Strymon was also modified. In the *Escorial Taktikon* its *strategos* is said to be ὁ Στρυμόνος ἤτοι Χρυσάβας and elsewhere Νέου Στρυμόνος.[7] N. Oikonomides has proposed that Chrysava be identified with Krousovo (modern Achladochori) situated in the Strymon valley northeast of Siderokastron.[8] A seal of the tenth century belonging to a Νικόλαος βασιλικὸς πρωτοσπαθάριος καὶ στρατηγὸς Χρυσάβας is also extant.[9]

A problem connected with the theme organisation is that of the *archon* and *archontia*. The name *archon* usually referred to the Slav commander of a Slavic tribe or a Sclavinia, but later on to the Greek commander of a Sclavinia or a subdivision of a theme (ἀρχοντία), as is proved by the names, Slavic or Greek, of the *archontes* on seals. The title *archon* indicates also the commander of the naval forces of a theme. It is a well known fact that coastal themes had naval forces under the jurisdiction of the relevant *strategos* to protect the coasts and the islands from the Arabs. It is most probable that the themes of Thessaloniki and Strymon had

---

1. Oikonomides, *Listes* 265.32, 267.6, 267.29); cf. ibid. 356, 357–8. For seals of a *tourmarches* of Veroia see P. Speck, *Byzantinische Bleisiegel in Berlin* (Bonn 1986) no. 146 (10/11th cent.); Zacos II 240.
2. Nesbitt & Oikonomides II 84; Oikonomides, *Listes* 357–8.
3. *DHGE* 12 (1953) col. 992.
4. *Ivir.* nos 9, 10; N. Oikonomides, *A Collection of Dated Byzantine Lead Seals* (Washington, D.C. 1986) no. 72; Nesbitt & Oikonomides II 84.
5. Nesbitt & Oikonomides I 21.1, 21.3 *et al.*
6. *Notitiae CP* 7.299, 9.185 *et al.*
7. Oikonomides, *Listes* 265.33, 357.
8. Oikonomides, *Listes* 357.
9. Nesbitt & Oikonomides I 40.1.

their own naval forces as well, and that the *archon* of Thessaloniki and the *archon* of Strymon or of Christoupolis, who are known from seals, were at the head of the naval forces of their respective themes.[1] The problem of the *archontes* still requires further study.

In 971 John Tzimiskes conquered Bulgaria, which became a province of the Byzantine Empire. After his death in 976 a rebellion of the Bulgarians under Samuel led to continuous warfare between the Empire and the Bulgarians which severely affected the western provinces of the Empire. Samuel proclaimed himself emperor, and having established his palaces at Achrida and Prespa conquered many cities and strongholds in Macedonia such as Veroia, Vodena (Edessa), Kastoria, Servia and Kolyndros. Thessaloniki became the centre of the imperial military forces, which were commanded by a *doux* or the *domestikos* of the Schools of the West, the supreme commander of the army, or even the emperor Basil II himself. After Samuel's death in 1014 Basil II continued the struggle until Bulgaria was finally conquered in 1018 and annexed to the empire.

The provincial administration was then reorganised by Basil II. Most of the western provinces of the state of Samuel formed the so-called theme of Bulgaria under a *doux* with Skopje as its capital, while the areas south of the Danube formed the Paristrion or Paradounavon theme with Dristra (Dorystolon) as its headquarters.[2] The area of Sirmium most probably formed the theme of Serbia.[3] Strongholds with their surrounding areas, which roughly corresponded to geographical divisions, formed smaller themes under a *strategos*. Thus the *strategoi* of Kastoria, Achrida, Deabolis and others are mentioned in the eleventh century.[4] It has been asserted that these smaller themes corresponded to the bishoprics which the three seals of Basil II show to be dependent on the Archbishopric of Achrida. But it is debatable whether Veroia and Servia, which were suffragans of the metropolis of Thessaloniki, were annexed to Achrida together with Stagoi in Thessaly as is stated in the third seal. The fact that there are references in later sources, e.g. Demetrios Chomatenos, which prove that Veroia and Servia continued to be subordinate to the metropolis of Thessaloniki, indicates that the third seal is spurious. If Servia had become subordinate to the Archbishop of Achrida even temporarily, it is strange indeed that Demetrios Chomatenos did not use it as an argument against the Patriarch Germanos' accusations, since Chomatenos had sanctioned the bishop of Servia in 1223.[5]

Continuous warfare during the tenth century ruined the countryside and the peasant soldiery. Measures taken by the emperors of the Macedonian dynasty

---

1. Cf. Ahrweiler, *Mer* 71–3; P. Yannopoulos, "Η οργάνωση του Αιγαίου κατά τη μεσοβυζαντινή περίοδο" *Parnassos* 32 (1990) 211, 213–4, 215, 218.
2. J. Karayannopoulos, *Ιστορία του Βυζαντινού Κράτους* II (Thessaloniki 1976) 464ff.
3. See recently J. Tzanis, *Το πρόβλημα της ύπαρξης βυζαντινού θέματος Σερβίας κατά τον 11ο μ.Χ. αιώνα* (PhD thesis, Thessaloniki 1994).
4. *SkylCont* 164.14 (Kastoria); Skyl. 354.75–76, 359.18 (Achris), 164.12–13 (Deabolis).
5. Chom. 150 (Pitra 578-88).

against the powerful proved inadequate in reducing their influence and halting centrifugal tendencies. Further division of the larger themes curbed the power of the *strategoi*, while the role of the *doukes* and of the *katepano* was increased because of new military needs. On the other hand political officials of the theme, e.g. the κριτὴς τοῦ θέματος, gained in significance. Due to these substantial changes the theme system began gradually to decline. Mercenary troops were used increasingly and the chief characteristic of the themes — their recruitment of peasant soldiers — began to disappear. The whole system began to disintegrate and the term theme is rarely used in the narrative sources and documents. From the eleventh century onwards regions designated as themes lost their military character and became administrative divisions and fiscal-judicial units.[1]

The themes of Macedonia continued to be divided into smaller units, most probably in the late tenth or early eleventh centuries during the wars of Basil II against the Bulgarians, as mentioned above. The theme of Zagoria, with Melenikon as its capital, was created out of the northern regions of the theme of Strymon. Its existence in 1014 is attested by Kekaumenos' *Strategikon*: Βασίλειος ... ἐχειρώσατο ιδ' χιλιάδας Βουλγάρους εἰς τὸ θέμα τῶν Ζαγορίων.[2] At the same time Voleron probably also constituted a separate theme. It is mentioned many times by John Skylitzes as the place where the Bulgarian captives were resettled by Basil the II following the wars against Samuel in Western Macedonia.

It has been shown that the new themes thus created had been former *tourmae* or *banda*, i.e. subdivisions of the older themes. This is corroborated by the Typikon of the great *domestikos* of the West, Gregory Pakourianos (founder of the Monastery of Petritzos, modern Bačkovo, in 1083), in which the theme of Voleron and its *banda* of Mosynopolis and Peritheorion are mentioned: ἐν τῷ θέματι τοῦ Βολεροῦ κατὰ τὴν τοποθεσίαν τοῦ βάνδου Μοσυνοπόλεως ... ὁμοίως ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ θέματι κατὰ τὸ βάνδον τὸ Περιθεώριον.[3] Thus Zagoria and the region of Serres had also been *turmae* of the theme of Strymon, while Zavaltia and Chrysava were *banda*.[4]

From the early eleventh century onwards the theme of Voleron was often united temporarily with the themes of Strymon and Thessaloniki, with Strymon alone, or with Serres, Strymon and Stromnitsa for financial, fiscal and judicial purposes. The same combinations of themes occur with Thessaloniki, Strymon and Drougoubiteia, or Strymon and Drougoubiteia, in documents of Mt. Athos and seals.

Information on provincial administration under the Komnenoi during the twelfth century can be drawn from the Chrysobull of Alexius III Angelos of

---

1. Cf. M. Gregoriou-Ioannidou, *Παρακμή και πτώση του θεματικού θεσμού. Συμβολή στην εξέλιξη της διοικητικής και της στρατιωτικής οργάνωσης του Βυζαντίου από τον 10ο αι. κ.ε.* (Thessaloniki 1985).
2. Kek. 152.20–3, comments 372.
3. "Le *typikon* de Sébaste Grégoire Pakourianos" ed. P. Gautier, *REB* 42 (1984) 5–145, lines 288–9, 299.
4. Ibid. 351–2.

November 1198, in which trade privileges were granted to Venice. Names of provinces where the Venetians could carry on their business transactions are listed. The following themes (*provinciae*) are mentioned in Macedonia: 1. Voleron, Strymon and Thessaloniki, 2. Zagoria, 3. Veroia, 4. Servia, 5. Stromnitsa, 6. Malesovo and Morovisdon, 7. Prilep and Pelagonia, Moliskos and Moglena, 8. Achrida, 9. Skopje, 10. Prespa, 11. Deabolis, 12. Kastoria.[1] These were actually towns with their surrounding districts, which were quite limited in area. Many of these themes are also mentioned in documents of Mt. Athos and seals.

The same themes are also listed in the Partition Treaty (*Partitio Romaniae*) drawn up by the crusaders and the Venetians in 1204 for the distribution of the provinces of the Byzantine Empire among themselves. Another theme is also mentioned, that of Vardariotae[2] (near modern Gevgeli), where Hungarian captives had settled in 934. The Axios River was perhaps called by them Bar-Dar, which means 'great River'. The same themes and towns such as Drama are recorded in the thirteenth century as administrative units by Demetrios Chomatenos and George Akropolites when Macedonia became part of the State of Epirus.

1. Tafel-Thomas, *Urkunden* I 246–80. Cf. D. Zakythenos, "Μελέται περί της διοικητικής διαιρέσεως και της επαρχιακής διοικήσεως εν τω βυζαντινώ κράτει" *EEBS* 17 (1941) 208–74, 18 (1948) 42–62.
2. A. Carile, "Partitio Terrarum Imperii Romaniae" *StVen* 7 (1965) 125–305. Cf. D.A. Zakythenos, "Μελέται περὶ τῆς διοικητικῆς διαιρέσεως καὶ τῆς ἐπαρχιακῆς διοικήσεως ἐν τῷ Βυζαντινῷ κράτει" *EEBS* 21 (1951) 179–206.

Gerhard Podskalsky

Two Archbishops of Achrida (Ochrid) and their significance for Macedonia's secular and church history: Theophylaktos and Demetrios Chomatenos

In the course of my first trip to Bulgaria in the summer of 1969 I also visited the cloister of The Holy Metamorphosis/Transfiguration (Preobraženie) near Veliko-Tărnovo, the old capital. One of the few remaining monks took us through the small chapel (katholikon), whose carved iconostasis (if I remember correctly: on the lower parts of the royal doors) depicted doves pecking at a bunch of grapes. Although this image is usually interpreted as an early Christian symbol of the soul's quest for everlasting salvation (eucharist!),[1] our guide, no doubt one of the less educated of his trade, offered an unexpected and altogether 'unscientific' explanation, albeit one meant in earnest: "The doves pecking at the grapes are the Greeks never ceasing to pick on the Bulgarians!" Spontaneous as this statement was, it nevertheless recalled the patriotic sentiments voiced by Bulgarians during the so-called Bulgarian Exarchate (1870–1953) in response to the Greek hierarchy of the 19th century, or to the Ecumenical Patriarchate on whose directions the latter had been sent to their country.

Yet the roots of the mutual antipathies between the Bulgarian/Macedonian side on the one hand and the Greek side on the other can be traced back to medieval times. It was Achrida's perhaps two most outstanding archbishops, Theophylaktos and Demetrios Chomatenos (who also enjoyed the title 'of Bulgaria' from 1020 to 1767), whose attitude played a significant, even catalytic, role in the matter. We may therefore ask whether these men were typical representatives of Greek prejudice against the Slavs or of Hellenic-Byzantine claims to monopolize Orthodoxy, or whether it was they who succeeded in overcoming, at least in rudimentary form, this fateful approach.

Theophylaktos of Achrida

Although our knowledge concerning Theophylaktos' biography has been broadened and deepened in the wake of Paul Gautier's editions[2] and further studies

1. Cf. F. Sühling, *Die Taube als relig. Symbol im christl. Altertum* (Freiburg 1930); A. Thomas, "Weintraube" *LCI* IV (Rome-Freiburg 1972) 494–6, here 495.
2. "Le discours de Théophylacte de Bulgarie à l'autocrator Alexis I[er] Comnène (6 janvier 1088)" *REB* 20 (1962) 93–130, ed. 109–120, cf. R. Anastasi, "Sul Logos basilikos di Teofilatto per Alessio Comneno" *Orpheus* n.s. 3 (1982) 358–62; id., *Deux oeuvres hagiographiques du Pseudo-Théophylacte* (unpublished diss., Paris 1968) ed. *Vita* of Clement of Achrida: 47–91, *Passio* of the 15 martyrs of Tiberioupolis: 226–83, cf. the negative comment of A. Vaillant, "Constantin-Cyrille et le Pseudo-Théophylacte" *Slavia* 38 (1969) 517–20; id., Theoph.Achrid. I, cf. summary by G. Prinzing in *BS* 45 (1984) 64–68; id., Theoph.Achrid. II, cf. the partly critical review by M. Mullett in *BS* 52 (1991) 157–62.

Byzantine Macedonia. Identity Image and History. Edited by John Burke & Roger Scott (*Byzantina Australiensia* 13, Melbourne 2000).

on the subject,[1] we remain dependent on hypotheses when dealing with the spiritual and intellectual background which influenced his multifarious work.[2] This dilemma is especially evident from the never-ending discussion on the authorship of two compositions whose themes are of particular interest to us, namely: a) the detailed life story of Clement of Achrida[3] (i.e. 'the Bulgarian Legend'); and b) the Passion of the 15 Martyrs of Tiberioupolis.[4]

---

1. D. Cuchlev, "Ochridski archiepiskop Teofilakt (1084–1108)" *Spis. na bălg. kniž. druž. v Sofija* 69 (1903) 161–99; I. Snegarov, *Istorija na Ochridskata archiepiskopija* I (Sofia 1924) 198–204; R. Katičić, "Βιογραφικὰ περὶ Θεοφυλάκτου Ἀχρίδος" *EEBS* 30 (1960–1) 364–85; Gautier, "L'épiscopat"; W. Swoboda, "Teofylakt" *Słownik starożytności słow.* 6 (Wrocław 1977) 59ff; D. Obolensky, "Theophylact of Ohrid", *Six Byzantine Portraits* (Oxford 1988) 34–82; G. Podskalsky, "Théophylacte d'Achrida, archevêque (+ vers 1120–26?)" *DictSpir* 15 (Paris 1991) 542–46.
2. For that 'continuity' see Leonid (Kavelin), *Sočinenija blaž. Feofilakta Bolgarskago, archiepiskopa Pervoj Justiniany* (Moscow 1870); A. Angelopulos, "Editions of the Works of the Archbishop of Bulgaria Theophylactos in the 18th and 19th Centuries" *Cultural Relations between Bulgarians and Greeks from the Middle of the 15th to the Middle of the 19th Centuries* (Sofia 1984) 78–83.
3. Ed. N.L. Tunickij, *Materialy dlja istorii žizni i dejatel'nosti učenikov svv. Kirilla i Mefodija* I (Sergiev Posad 1918, rp. London 1972) 66–140; for earlier ed., id., *Sv. Kliment, episkop Slovenskij* (Sergiev Posad 1913, rp. Munich 1970) 6–18; A. Milev, *Žitie na Kliment Ochridski* (Sofia 1955) 32–88; id., *Grăckite žitija na Kliment Ochridski* (Sofia 1966) 76–146; Gautier, *Deux oeuvres* (see n. 2); K. Nichoritis, *Atonskata knižovna tradicija v razprostranenieto na Kirilo-Metodievskite izvori* (Sofia 1990) 195–216; Engl. tr. by I. Duichev, *Kiril and Methodius* (New York 1985) 93–125. For discussion of authorship cf. N.L. Tunickij, "K voprosu o proizchoždenii i avtore bolgarskoj legendy" *Sborn. statej posv. V.I. Lamanskomu* 2 (St. Petersburg 1908) 769–86; M. Muretov, "Grečeskoe 'Žitie' sv. Klimenta, episk. Slovenskogo" *Bogosl. vestnik* 22/2 (1913) 475–87; M. Jugie, "L'auteur de la vie de s. Clément de Bulgarie" *EO* 23 (1924) 5–8; O. Polách, "Kdo je autorem tak zv. 'bulharské legendy'?" *Acta Acad. Velehr.* 18 (1947) 53–74; M. Kusseff, "St. Clement of Ochrida" *SlEERev* 27 (1948) 193–215, here 196–201; A. Milev, "Za avtorstvoto na prostrannoto Klimentovo žitie" *Izv. na Inst. za bălg. lit.* 5 (1957) 405–34; I. Snegarov, "Les sources sur la vie et l'activité de Clément d'Ochrida" *Byz-Bulg.* 1 (1962) 79–119; I. Dujčev, "Kliment Ochridski i negovoto delo v naučna knižnina" *Kliment Ochridski* (Sofia 1966) 415–37; id., "Kliment Ochridski v naučnoto direne" *Kliment Ochridski* (Sofia 1968) 21–31; S. Maslev, "Zur Quellenfrage der *Vita Clementis*" *BZ* 70 (1977) 310–15; J. Leśny, "Żywoty św. Klimenta Ochrydskiego" *Słownik* 7 (see n. 3) 307–309; D. Obolensky, "Theophylactos of Ohrid and the authorship of the *Vita Clementis*" *Festscrhift Stratos* 601–18; K. Nichoritis, "Kăm văprosa za avtorstvoto na Prostrannoto žitie na sv. Kliment Ochridiski (Novi svedenija)" *Duch. kultura* 68/2 (1988) 13–19; D. Gones, *Ὁ βίος τοῦ ἁγίου Κλήμεντος Ἀχρίδος στὰ πλαίσια τῆς Βυζαντινῆς ἁγιολογίας* (Athens 1989); I. Iliev, "Beležki vărchu tvorčestvoto na Teofilakt Ochridski" *IstPreg* 47/3 (1991) 67–91, here 83–87 (*Passio*), 87–91 (*Vita*); id., "The Manuscript Tradition and the Authorship of the Long Life of St. Clement of Ohrid" *BS* 53 (1992) 68–73; N. Dragova, "Theophylact of Ochrida's Old Bulgarian Sources on Cyril and Methodius, *EtBalk* 28/3-4 (1992) 107–110; P. Devos, "L'auteur de la vie de S. Clément d'Ochrida" *AB* 112 (1994) 32.
4. Cf. V.N. Zlatarski, "Legenda za otkrivane moštite na Tiveriupolskite măčenici" *Otčet na Bălg. archeol. inst. za 1921 g.* (Sofia 1922) 22–37, also in *Izbr. proizvedenija* 1 (Sofia 1972) 190–205; N. Dragova, "Starobălgarskite izvori na žitieto za petnadesette tiveriupolski

One reason advanced to contest Theophylaktos' authorship of the first work is the apparent irreconcilability of his depreciative judgements on the Bulgarians in various letters[1] (similar to the ones made later by Demetrios Chomatenos) with the praise of Bulgaria encountered in the biography (P. Gautier), which goes so far as to identify with the country (D. Gones speaks of the text's 'Bulgarocentrism'). Others have rightly pointed out, however, that negative comments on the Bulgarians (such as on their *grubost* 'toughness') can be found in the letters as well as in the life history of Clement (K. Nichorites). More important still is the argument first put forward in Margaret Mullet's dissertation[2] that the upper-class snobbery vis-à-vis the uneducated masses occasionally displayed in his letters (and as such reflecting his family background) should not be taken as manifestations of a nationalist spirit, since such arrogance could affect both Greek and non-Greek populations alike (as the example of the Metropolitan Michael Choniates in Athens proves)[3] (D. Obolensky). Finally, Theophylaktos' efforts to alleviate the lot of the exploited and overwhelmingly Slav population in his diocese, as illustrated in his correspondence where he pillories the injustices committed by Byzantine tax collectors (φοροεισπράκτορες),[4] ought to be considered alongside the defence of the privileges of his archbishopric. Even if these references cannot establish the origin of the Clement *vita* with any certainty, they do suggest the possibility, if not the likelihood, of Theophylaktos' authorship. Since preparations for a canonization usually require that both the *vita* and the office be drawn up by the same author, the

---

măčenici ot Teofilakt Ochridiski" *StBalc* 2 (Sofia 1970) 105–131; A. Angelopulos, "Οἱ ιε' Ἱερομάρτυρες Τιβεριουπόλεως-Στρωμνίτσης" *Makedonika* 20 (1980) 463–84; id., "Petnadesette tiveriopolski măčenici v grăcko-bălg. duchovno predanie" *Izv. na cărkovnoistor. i archiven inst.* 2 (1984) 102–111; O.V. Ivanova, "Bolgarskie istoričeskie tradicii v sočinenii Feofilakta Ochridskogo" *Etničeskie processy v Central'noj i Jugo-Vostočnoj Evrope* (Moscow 1988) 55–63.

1. Cf. A Leroy-Molinghen, "Du destinataire de la lettre Finetti I de Théopylacte de Bulgarie" *Byz* 36 (1966) 431–37; G. Podskalsky, "Das Verhältnis von Griechen und Bulgaren" *BS* 29 (1978) 34–8.
2. *Theophylact through his Letters: the Two Worlds of an Exiled Bishop* (Birmingham 1981), now published under the title *Theophylact of Ochrid. Reading the letters of a Byzantine Archbishop* (Aldershot 1997); part of a chapter was published earlier as "The Disgrace of the Ex-Basilissa Maria" *BS* 45 (1984) 202–211.
3. G. Stadtmüller, *Michael Choniates, Metr. von Athen* (Rome 1934) 154–66, esp. 155ff.
4. V.N. Zlatarski, "Namestnici-upraviteli na Bălgarija prez caruvaneto na Aleksija Komnin" *BS* 4 (1932) 139–58, 371–98; V.A. Nikolaev, *Feodalni otnošenija v pokorenata ot Vizantija Bălgarija, otrazeni v pismata na Teofilakt Ochridski, Archiepiskop Bălgarski* (Sofia 1951), cf. the critical review by R. Janin in *REB* 10 (1952) 261; B. Nerantzi-Varmazi, "Ο Θεοφύλακτος Αχρίδος και ο δυτικομακεδονικός χώρος" *Byzantina* 15 (1989) 343–49; E.S. Papagianne, "Φορολογικὲς πληροφορίες ἀπὸ ἐπιστολὲς τοῦ Μεγάλου Βασιλείου (329/31–379) καὶ τοῦ Θεοφυλάκτου Ἀχρίδος (1050/55–1125/26)" *Ἡ καθημερινὴ ζωὴ στὸ Βυζάντιο* (Athens 1989) 391–407, here 396–405; M. Mullet, "Patronage in Action: the Problems of an eleventh-century Bishop" *Church and People in Byzantium* ed. R. Morris (Birmingham 1990) 125–47 (the best work).

recent fixation on the first Clement office by Theophylaktos[1] further reinforces the above conclusions.

As to the second work, namely the *Passio* of the 15 Martyrs of Tiberioupolis, which is evidently set successively in early Christendom from the 4th and 6th until the 9th centuries (i.e. the era of the Slav invasions in the Balkans), a similar argument (as in the case of the Clement *vita*) has been proffered according to which the author of both works used, translated, and inserted available ancient Slavic sources (for a different view, see P. Gautier). Yet the significance of this hagiographical story lies in its emphasis on the rootedness of the newly baptized Bulgarian Christians in ancient Christianity, based on a report of the erection of a Church in honour of the 15 Martyrs in the recently founded bishopric of Bregalnica (probably near Strumica).[2]

Further proof that Theophylaktos was neither an extreme polemicist nor driven by cynical, implacable prejudice against heterodox or alien populations is found in his (for our purposes marginal) dialogue on the charges raised against the Latins,[3] a text which relies heavily on the attitude of the irenic Patriarch Petros III of Antioch (from 1052).

But let us return once more to Theophylaktos' extensive correspondence, which unfortunately has not yet been arranged in chronological order.[4] In it we can

---

1. G. Balasčev, *Kliment, episkop slovenski, i službata mu po star slovenski prevod s edna čast' grăcki paralelen tekst i edno faksimile* (Sofia 1898), ed. α-μς; Tunickij, *Sv. Kliment* (see n. 5) 98–101; I. Snegarov, "Neizdadeni prepisi ot grăcki služби na sv. Kliment Ochridski" *Godišn. Duch. Ak. "Sv. Kliment Ochr."* 5 (31) (1955/6) 221–39; *Cyrillometh.* 10 (1986) 53–120; K. Nichoritis, "Neizvestni prepisi ot Službata i ot Prostrannoto žitie na Kliment Ochridski" *Kirilo-Metod. Studii* 3 (Sofia 1986) 66–71, here 68–71; id., "Teofilakt Ochridski-Avtor na părvičnata grăcka služba na Kliment Ochridski" *Godišn. Sof. univ. 'Sv. Kliment Ochr.', Naučen centăr za slavj.-viz. proučvanija 'Ivan Dujčev'* 83 (3) (1989) 163–78; M.D. Peyfuss, *Die Druckerei von Moschopolis 1731–1769* (Vienna-Cologne 1989) 115–20; Nichoritis, *Atonskata kniž.* (see n. 5) 216–26.

2. D. Koco, "Prilog kon proučvanjeto na Bregalničkata episkopija" *Zborn. Sv. Radojčića* (Belgrade 1969) 155–162; Obolensky, "Theophylact" (see n. 3) 71–7; B. Aleksova, *Episkopijata na Bregalnica* (Prilep 1989).

3. Theoph.Achrid. I 247–85. Cf. J. Dräseke, "Theophylaktos' Schrift gegen die Lateiner" *BZ* 10 (1901) 515–29; B. Leib, *Rome, Kiev et Byzance à la fin du XIe s.* (Paris 1924) 41–50; A. Quacquarelli, "La lettera di Teofilatto d'Acrida: gli errori dei Latini" *Rassegna di sc. filos.* 2 (1949) 2–3, 11–40; S. Ferrara, *L'unionismo di Teofilatto d'Acrida nell'opusculo "De iis quorum latini incusantur"* (diss., Rome 1951); M. Trombacco, *Teofilatto di Bulgaria tra Oriente e Occidente* (diss., Bari 1979); E. Papayanni, "Rome et C/ople dans l'oeuvre de Théophylacte archevêque d'Achrida (1050/55–1125/26?)" *Idea giuridica e politica di Roma e personalità storiche* I (Rome 1991) 79–94. On the basis of internal evidence (i.e. because of his basically irenic tendency) another anti-Latin tract attributed to Theophylact cannot have been written by him: P. Gautier, "Un second traité contre les Latins attribué à Théophylacte de Bulgarie" *Theologia* 48 (1977) 546–69.

4. Theoph.Achrid. II. Cf. in general K. Roth, "Studie zu den Briefen des Theophylaktos Bulgarus" *Progr. des k. Gymnasiums Ludwigshafen a. Rh.* (1900) 1–22; Simeon (Nankov), *Pismata na Teofilakta Ochridski, archiepiskop Bălgarski* (Sofia 1931); V.N. Zlatarski, *Istorija na bălg. dăržava prez srednite vekove* II (Sofia 1934) 261–350, 503–15; G.G. Litavrin, "Budapeštskaja rukopis' pisem Feofilakta Bolgarskogo" *IzvInstBŭlgIst* 14/15

find numerous observations on the beginnings of the Bogomil movement in Macedonia, even if names and an ethnic division into Greeks and Bulgarians are missing; already P. Uspenskij hypothesized that the description of a certain monk who sheds his monastic habit to indulge in all forms of intemperance was based on Basileios, the Bogomil leader who was later burned in Constantinople.[1] Aside from the religious component, the correspondence also includes irreplaceable information on Macedonia's political and economic history.[2] A very short and puzzling later letter addressed "to the Bulgarians" (i.e. students?), to whom he also paid his respects individually,[3] remains to be explained satisfactorily.[4] Theophylaktos also testified to having taken part in the annual celebrations (15 May) for St. Achilleios in Prespa, where the said (local) veneration had commenced following the transfer of the relics by Czar Samuel (976/996–1014).[5] By contrast, the three letters to one or more members of the Pakourianos family seem, for reasons of content and timing, to speak against the founder of the well-known Monastery of the Mother of God (Petritzos/Bačkovo) near Plovdiv.[6]

Although apparently unable to master Bulgarian,[7] Theophylaktos was also concerned with the lower classes in his intensive and competent commitment to Macedonia[8] and to (Eastern) Bulgaria (see, for example, the three letters on the defence of a simple monk against the bishop of Triadica/Sofia). Theophylaktos discloses in his work an intellectual open-mindedness transcending the ethnic boundaries of his day, an approach which had once characterized the seven apostles of the Slavs (and which would later be taken up by his successors Demetrios

---

(1964) 511–24; *Vizantijski izvori za istoriju naroda Jugoslavije* III (Belgrade 1966) 257–360 (extracts from 79 letters, Serbo-Croatian transl. with commentary by R. Katičić).

1. B. Panov, "Bogomil'skoe dviženie v Makedonii na osnavanii pisem Feofilakta Ochridskogo" 14 *CEB* [Bucharest 1971] 721–7; id., "Bogomilskoto dviženje vo Makedonija odrazeno vo pismata na Teofilakt Ohridski" *Godišen zborn, Fil. fak.* 2 (28) (Skopje 1976) 179–91. The renegade monk is described in letter 11, Theoph.Achrid. II 163 lines 8–16.
2. D.A. Xanalatos, *Beiträge zur Wirtschafts- u. Sozialgesch. Makedoniens im Mittelalter, hauptsächlich auf Grund der Briefe des Erzbischofs Theophylaktos von Achrida* (diss., Munich 1937); B. Panov, "Ohrid vo krajot na XI i početokot na XII v. vo svetlinata na pismata na Teofilakt Ohridski" *Zborn. Arheol. Muzej na Makedonija* 6/7 (1967–74, appeared 1975) 181–95; id., "Osvoboditel'noe dviženie v Zapadnoj Makedonii v konce 11 veka, otražennoe v pismach Feofilakta Ochridskogo" *JÖB* 32/2 (1982) 195–205.
3. I. Djurić, "Teofilakt Ohridski pod šatorom Arona" *ZRVI* 27/28 (1989) 69–91.
4. Theoph.Achrid. II 517 no. 103. Cf. S. Maslev, "Za roljata i značenieto na dejnostta na Teofilakt Ochridski kato archiepiskop bălgarski" *IzvInstBălglst.* 23 (1974) 235–47.
5. Theoph.Achrid. II 415 no. 78.
6. So Gautier in Theoph.Achrid. II 98–100, as against R. Katičić, "Αἱ πρὸς Πακουριανοὺς ἐπιστολαὶ τοῦ Θεοφυλάκτου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Ἀχρίδος" *EEBS* 30 (1960/61) 386–97.
7. In his letters there are only minor traces of the Slavic language: A. Leroy-Molinghen, "Trois mots slaves dans les lettres de Théophylacte de Bulgarie" *AIPhO* 6 (1938) 111–7.
8. R. Katičić, "Korrespondencija Teofilakta Ohridskog kao izvor za historiju srednjovekovne Makedonije" *ZRVI* 8 (1964) 177–89; B. Panov, *Teofilakt Ohridski kako izvor za srednovekovnata istorija na maked. narod.* (Skopje 1971).

Chomatenos and Konstantinos Kabasilas). On these grounds Theophylaktos should be mentioned in any history of Bulgaria's theological literature. Indeed, South Slavic Orthodoxy judged Theophylaktos in a similiar vein, not the least because works of his with no direct link to Bulgaria/Macedonia were translated into medieval Bulgarian. Thus we not only know the year (1348) and the translator's name (Pope Teotokij Psilica of Tărnovo) of the Slavic version of his commentary on St. John's Gospel,[1] but also record that many manuscript catalogues contain a large number of copies of the prefaces to the four commentaries on the gospels that had been translated into Slavic.[2] Other kinds of works (e.g. sermons) also found their translators in the Balkans.[3]

To sum up: in spite of his living in an intellectual and societal schizophrenia regarding his wishful dream of Constantinople on the one hand, and Achrida, where he worked and which he faithfully defended, on the other hand (all of which was admitted in a letter to the former empress Maria of Alani),[4] the outsider Theophylaktos succeeded, to a remarkable extent, in taking up and continuing the spiritual traditions of the Slavic province under his charge.[5] In short, he knew nothing of a moronic nationalism or of cultural imperialism.

Demetrios Chomatenos

In the field of hagiography some parallels exist between the widely productive (ranging from exegesis to poetry) Theophylaktos and his successor Demetrios

---

1. K.K. Kuev, *Sădbata na starobălg. răkopis prez vekovete* (Sofia 1979) 188.
2. Cf. e.g. P.P. Panaitescu, *Manuscrisele slave din Biblioteka Academiei RPR* 1 (Bucharest 1959) 267f no 179, as well as 13 further MSS (nos. 182, 185, 189–197, 199f); N.Ju. Bubnov, O.P. Lichačeva & V.F. Pokrovskaja, *Pergamennye rukopisi biblioteki AN SSSR* (Leningrad 1976) 205ff no. 394; N.A. Doldobanova & O.A. Knjaževskaja, "Bolgarskaja rukopisnaja kniga X–XVIII vv." *Archeogr. ežeg. za 1978 g.* (Moscow 1979) 357f (commentary on the Gospel by Th. of Achrida with signature of Teodosij of Tărnovo 14th c.); A.-E.N. Tachiaos, *The Slavonic manuscripts of the Panteleimon Monastery (Rossikon) on Mount Athos* (Thessaloniki-Los Angeles 1981) 69ff no. 25; E. Matthes, *Katalog der slav. Handschriften in Bibliotheken der Bundesrepublik Deutschland* (Wiesbaden 1990) 21ff no. 23; 64ff no. 64; 117ff no. 137; 135 no. 161; 146 no. 180; N.R. Sindik, M. Grozdanović-Pajić & K. Mano-Zisi, *Opis rukopisa i starih štampanih knjiga biblioteke Srpske pravoslavne eparhije Budimske i Sentandreji* (Belgrade-Novi Sad 1991) 153ff no. 107ff. For the reception of the biblical commentaries of Theophylaktos by the Slavs cf. also the first answer of the Ecumenical Patriarch Gennadios II Scholarios to the Serbian despot Djuradj Branković: L. Petit, X.A. Sideridès & M. Jugie, *Oeuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios* 4 (Paris 1935) 207. For the Greek original: Ch.I. Papaioannou, "Ἓν χειρόγραφον τοῦ ὑπομνήματος τοῦ ἀρχιεπισκόπου Βουλγαρίας Θεοφυλάκτου εἰς τὰ 4 εὐαγγέλια" *Theologia* 3 (1925) 243–55; J. Reuss, *Matthäus-, Markus- u. Johannes-Katenen* (Münster 1941) 220–37; E.W. Saunders, "Theophylact of Bulgaria as writer and biblical interpreter" *Bibl. Research* 2 (1957) 31–44.
3. Panaitescu, op.cit. 200–210 no. 152; B.St. Angelov, "Za avtora na 'Slovo za mironosicite'" *Starobălg. lit.* 4 (1979) 39–46.
4. Theoph.Achrid. II 141 lines 58–9.
5. Cf. the comprehensive essay by P.Ch. Ilievski, "Grčkoslovenska kulturna simbioza vo Makedonija" *Slovenska pismenost* (Ohrid 1966) 45–55.

Chomatenos (second half of the 12th century, after 1236; term of office: c. 1216 – c. 1236), who has become known, above all, as a canon law specialist and whose biography likewise contains many gaps with regard to his youth and old age.[1] The anthology of his canonical works (1891) by the Benedictine Cardinal J.B. Pitra,[2] while commendable in its time and emended in later years,[3] cannot altogether satisfy. Only with the new critical edition (πονήματα διάφορα) by G. Prinzing (Mainz), which contains a detailed introduction to his life and work, will legal historians find a satisfactory basis from which to embark on their studies.

But for now we are interested in the brief *vita* of Clement of Achrida, the so-called 'Ochrid Legend',[4] which initially was not ascribed to Chomatenos and later was denied him. A number of arguments were put forward to dispute Chomatenos' authorship: numerous gross historical errors (Boris and Michael [i.e. Symeon?], for example, are regarded as two different people, cf. no. 11); the contention that Clement of Achrida invented Cyrillic (no. 14), even though Achrida and its environs were a centre of glagolithic scriptoria and Theophylaktos never once mentioned such an undoubtedly significant event.[5] In the light of these reservations, the date of origin (the 'seat of life') of the *vita* also remains in the

---

1. I. Snegarov, "Položenieto na Ochridskata Archiepiskopija ot văzstanovjavaneto na vtoroto bălg. carstvo do 1334 g." *Minalo* 3/9 (1914) 38–57; id., *Istorija* (see n. 3) 207–10; A.P. Christophilopulos, "Δημήτριος Χωματιανός" *Theologia* 20 (1949) 741–9; L. Stiernon, "Démétrios Chomatianos ou Chomatenos" *DHGE* 14 (Paris 1960) 199–205; N.B. Tomadakes, Σύλλαβος Βυζαντινῶν μελετῶν καὶ κειμένων (Athens 1961) 437–42; G. Prinzing, "Chomatenos (also: Chomatianos), Demetrios" *LMA* 2 (Munich-Zurich 1983) 1874–5; St. Rek, "Dymitr Chomatian" *Słownik* 8 (see n. 3, Wrocław 1991) 104–5.
2. Pitra, *Analecta* VI; cf. the positive review by A. Momferratos in *VizVrem* 2 (1895) 426–8.
3. M. Drinov, "O nekotorych trudach Dimitrija Chomatiana kak istoričeskom materiale" *VizVrem* 1 (1894) 319–40, 2 (1895) 1–23, also in *Trudove na M. S. Drinova* 1 (Sofia 1909) 583–629; N.A. Bees, "Εἰς Δημήτριον Χωματιανόν" *VizVrem* 20 (1913), also in id. 3, 64ff; I. Snegarov, "Nejakolko dumi za Chomatianovija sbornik, izdaden ot Pitra" *Godišn. Sof. univ., Bogosl. fak.* 4 (1926/27) 173–83; N.P. Matses, *Νομικὰ ζητήματα ἐκ τῶν ἔργων τοῦ Δημητρίου Χωματιανοῦ* (Athens 1961); G.S. Marcou, "Demetrio Chomatianos nel quadro della cultura bizantina del sec. XIII (Correzioni al codice Monac. gr. 62 edito dal Card. G. B. Pitra)" *EEPASPE* (Athens 1976/7, appeared 1978) 435–46.
4. Ed. J. Ivanov, *Bălg. starini iz Makedonija* (Sofia 1931, rp. 1970) 316–21; A. Teodorov-Balan, *Kiril i Metodi* 2 (Sofia 1934) 179–87; I. Dujčev, "Kratkoto Klimentovo žitie ot Dimitrij Chomatian" *Kliment Ochridski. Sbornik ot statii po slučaj 1050 godini ot smărtta mu* (Sofia 1966) 161–71, ed. 165–71, also in *Proučvanija vărchu srednovekovnata bălg. istorija* (Sofia 1981) 164–73; Milev, *Grăckite žitija* (see n. 5) 166–86; M. Georgievski & R. Iljovski, "Novootkrien rakopis od početotok na XVIII vek so kratkoto žitie na Kliment Ohridski" *Glasnik na Inst. za nacion. istor.* 18/2 (1974) 237–49, ed. 239–44; English trans. by Duichev, *Kiril* (see n. 5) 127–30; for the older ed. cf. V. Grigorovič, "Izyskanija o slavj. apostolach proizvedennyja v stranach Evropejskoj Turcii" *ŽMNP* 53.1 (1847) 1–28, ed. 14–24; E. Georgiev, "Kratkoto žitie na Kliment Ochridski v novo osvetlenie" *Literaturna misăl* 19/4 (1975) 102–9; M.D. Peyfuss, "Eine unbekannte Edition der 'Legenda Achridensis'" *Die slaw. Sprachen* 1 (1982) 60–71 (for the Venice ed. 1700?).
5. A. Leskien, "Zur Kritik der kürzeren Legende vom h. Clemens" *Arch. f. slav. Philol.* 3 (1879) 79–83; Tunickij, *Sv. Kliment* (see n. 5) 89–98; Georgiev, loc. cit.

dark.[1] One argument in favour of Demetrios as author is an acrostic (Κλήμεντα τιμῶ ποιμενάρχης Βουλγάρων Δημήτριος) in a canon[2] on Clement written by him which displays literary motifs from the *vita*. Besides, both the *vita* and the canon represent hymns in honour of the Bulgarian neophytes and the preaching of the Gospel in Moesia by the seven apostles of the Slavs. The critical or negative judgement on the Bulgarians (similar to the one found in Theophylaktos), on the other hand, was restricted to the field of education[3] and therefore cannot substantially qualify the main tenor of both works.

Like his predecessor Theophylaktos, and in contrast to his colleague and canon law specialist Theodore Balsamon (Patriarch of Antioch with residence in Constantinople, from 1195), Chomatenos also rejected any form of rigorism towards the Latins and fully agreed with Theophylaktos' position, namely that only the *Filioque* denoted a serious difference from the Latins.[4]

Yet Demetrios Chomatenos was also concerned with eastern Bulgaria ('Zagora') in other ways, inasmuch as Czar Kalojan's union with Rome, established in 1204 and witnessing signs of disintegration soon after his death before being finally repealed in a treaty with the Byzantine patriarch in Nicaea (1235), had given rise to difficult questions regarding the approach towards the formerly uniate bishops (patriarchs), as well as the ordinations bestowed by them. Chomatenos' tendency to be lenient (οἰκονομία) was revealed in this instance too. Whereas the synod in Constantinople could not agree on whether to accept the ordinations conferred by the Patriarch (Primas) of Tărnovo and the Latin Patriarch of Constantinople or whether to dismiss all concerned hierarchs, Demetrios Chomatenos advocated a compromise solution: the legal force of the ordination of priests and bishops was to be recognized (not least in order to ensure the legality of the sacraments conferred by these), while the hierarchs were to give up their offices, leaving only sub-deacons, deacons, and priests in their posts.[5]

Best-known, however, is Chomatenos' letter of protest against the foundation of an autocephalous archbishopric of Serbia (1219/20) and the appointment of the

---

1. P. St Koledarov, "Koga i zašto Dimităr Chomatian e napisal kratkoto žitie na Kliment Ochridski" *Literaturna misăl* 27/3 (1989) 89–100.
2. Hieromon. Gregorios (ed.), *Ἀκολουθία τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Κλήμεντος Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Ἀχριδῶν, νεωστὶ καὶ τῷ τύπῳ ἐκδεδομένη, συλλεχθεῖσα ἐκ τῶν συγγραμμάτων τοῦ τε Δημητρίου τοῦ Χωματιανοῦ καὶ τοῦ Καβάσιλα, Ἀρχιεπισκόπων τοῦ αὐτοῦ θρόνου χρηματισάντων* (Moschopolis 1742); Nichoritis, *Atonskata kniž.* (see n. 5) 227–32. Cf. A Papadopulos-Kerameus, "Βυζαντινὰ Ἀνάλεκτα" *BZ* 8 (1899) 75f; I.Ž. Dimitrov, "Über einige Fragen der griech. Akoluthien der hll. Kyrill u. Method (Lebensbeschreibende Angaben aus den griech. Akoluthien)" *Symposium Methodianum* (Neuried 1988) 415–20, here 417f.
3. Podskalsky, "Das Verhältnis" (see n. 7) 37.
4. Pitra, *Analecta* VI 625–30 (answer to the third question of the metropolitan Konstantinos Kabasilas of Dyrrhachion; cf. altogether: 617–86); also Rhalles-Potles, *Syntagma* V 434–36 (omitted by Pitra).
5. Pitra, loc.cit. 563–70.

Holy Sabas as its first spiritual leader;[1] for some suffragans (Rasa) in this new province of the Church had until then belonged to Achrida. This conflict, in which the Ecumenical Patriarch Germanos II was dragged in (he was to become the main 'culprit'),[2] was not concerned with the national issues but rather with coming to terms with the political situation in the Church after 1204 (the breakdown of the Byzantine Empire together with all of its Church structures), where Achrida's hitherto uncontested autocephaly, defended by Chomatenos in a patriarchal manner with quotations from numerous ecumenical councils and particular synods,[3] appeared to have become a dangerous rival of the weakened patriarchy in Constantinople/Nicaea. Demetrios' threat, found towards the end of his letter, to excommunicate Sabas was bound to have no effect given that the former had not ordained the latter. Besides, Chomatenos' accusing Sabas of seeking fame (δοξομανία) completely failed to appreciate the true background underlying the jurisdiction of the new order.

Finally, further proof that Demetrios was not in principle ill-disposed towards the Serbs (as Slavs) are his 14 canonical answers to the Serbian leader Stefan Radoslav (c. 1192–after 1235; rule: 1228–34),[4] which dealt with liturgical (e.g. *Azyma*) and disciplinary details (e.g. fasting) of a more secondary nature and which are only explicable with reference to contact with Latin customs. The Slavic name of Radoslav (from Prilep; another name is unclear) also appears in the (13) well-known demands for penance by Chomatenos, which contain much valuable information on the history of Macedonia, and one of which was compiled in

---

1. Pitra, loc.cit. 381–90; G. Ostrogorski, "Pismo Dimitrija Homatijana sv. Savi i odlomak Homatijanovog pisma patrijarhu Germanu o Savinom posvećenju" *Sveto-Savski zborn.* 2 (1938) 89–111, also in *Vizantija i Sloveni* (*Sabrana dela G. Ostrogorskog* 4, Belgrade 1970) 170–89; cf. the corrections by F. Dölger in *BZ* 39 (1939) 499ff; Serbian transl. by St. Novaković, "Protest Dimitrija Homatijana" *Srpski Sion* 15/1 (1905) 4–6.
2. Besides Ostrogorski (loc.cit.) cf. also D.M. Nicol, "Kaisersalbung" *BMGS* 2 (1976) 37–52, here 42–52; G. Prinzing, "Die 'Antigraphe' des Patr. Germanos II. an Erzbischof Demetrios Chomatenos von Ohrid u. die Korrespondenz zum nikäisch-epirotischen Konflikt 1212–1233" *RSBS* 3 (1983, appeared 1984) 21–64.
3. Cf. D. Ružić, *Die Bedeutung des Demetrios Chomatianos für die Gründungsgesch. der serb. Autokephalie* (diss. with H. Gelzer, Jena 1893); J. H(adži)-V(asiljević), "Dimitrije Homatijan, arhiepiskop Ohridski, o sv. Savi i nezavisnosti Srpske crkve" *Brastvo* 28 (1934) 76–84; M. Petrović, "Istorijsko-pravna strana Homatijanovog pisma 'Najprečasnijem medju monasima i sinu velikog župana Srbije Kir Savi'" *ZRVI* 19 (1980) 173–208; I. Tarnanides, *Ἱστορία τῆς Σερβικῆς ἐκκλησίας* (Thessaloniki 1982) 42–4; V.Th. Kontovas, "Δημήτριος Χωματιανός, ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Ἀχρίδος, καὶ Σάββας Νεμάνια, ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Ἰπεκίου" *GregPal* 73 (1990) 576–637.
4. Ed. M.A. Petronijević, "Dimitrija Homatinskog odgovori na pitanja kralja Stefana Prvovenčanog o crkvenim stvarima" *Glasnik Srpskog naučn. društ.* 33 (1872) 1–37; Pitra, *Analecta* VI 685–710; F. Granić, "Odgovori Ohridskog arhiepiskopa Dimitrija Homatijana na pitanja srpskog kralja Stefana Radoslava" *Svetosavski zborn.* 2 (1938) 147–89 ed. 154–88.

cooperation with the responsible Bishop of Pelagonia (Bitola/Manastir).[1] The special and lasting relationship with Achrida is revealed in the inscription of a silverplated icon of Christ, whose interpretation in the existing literature is controversial and far from over yet. [2]

Looking at the works of these two outstanding archbishops of Achrida more closely (the same could be done with regard to others, such as Konstantinos Kabasilas, and from the era of Turkish rule), we see that although both were subject to culture shock, being as they were members of a civic culture in an ethnically mixed province, they never confronted the main characteristics of Slavic Christendom with derision or separation, but successfully tried to interpret the latter within the proven structures (e.g. hagiography) available to them.

1. D. Simon, "Die Bussbescheide des Erzbischofs Chomatian von Ochrid" *JÖB* 37 (1987) 235–75, esp. 255f; S.N. Trojanos, "Der Teufel im orth. Kirchenrecht" *BZ* 90 (1997) 97–111, here 103f.
2. B. Filov, "Ochridskijat nadpis na Dimitrija Chomatian" *SpBAN* 24 (1922) 1–8; S. Michajlov, "Kăm razčitaneto na nadpisa na Dimităr Chomatian vărchu edna Ochridska ikona" *Archeol.* 20/3 (1978) 47–49; S.K. Kisas, "Natpis Dimitrija Homatijana na okuvu ikone Hriste Velikog Arhiereja iz Ohrida" *ZbLikUmet* 23 (1987) 167–73, ed. 167.

Demetrios J. Constantelos

Classical Greek Heritage in the Epistles of Theophylaktos of Achrida

Athens or Jerusalem? Hellenism or Christianity? Biblical revelation or Greek natural theology? These are a few of the alternatives posed either directly or indirectly by Christian intellectuals of the first four centuries of our era, churchmen like the Syrian Tatian, the Latin Tertullian, and the Greek Epiphanios of Cyprus.[1]

The Christian encounter with Hellenism has been a lively issue for many centuries and the bibliography on the subject is extensive. In one of the most authoritative recent studies on the subject, Jaroslav Pelikan of Yale University[2] raises a relevant question: how did Greek Church Fathers of the Byzantine era manage to remain culturally and intellectually Greek and yet be Christian at the same time? His extensive discussion of the Cappadocian Fathers Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, their sister Makrina, and Gregory the Theologian, who set the standards and became the prototypes for Church Fathers and theologians of the Greek Middle Ages and later, provides the answer: the Fathers remained essentially Greek because they had been excellently trained in the classical Greek heritage (language, literature, philosophy, history) as well as the Christian scriptures.[3] They found no antithesis between the ideals of Hellenism, and in particular its teachings about natural revelation, and the teachings of Christianity.

It is in the context of this tradition of learning that I approach my topic on the classical Greek heritage in the epistles of Theophylaktos of Achrida. Theophylaktos, like other traditionalist Church Fathers before and after him, followed the practice of the early Church Fathers who had achieved a synthesis between the Greek logos and Christian scripture, between Athens and Jerusalem. The writings of Theophylaktos confirm beyond any doubt that he remained Greek while being a Christian because of his excellent training in both traditions. His epistles in particular indicate that he would not have been disturbed by Tertullian's question, "What has Athens to do with Jerusalem?"

A

Known as Theophylaktos Hephaestos, Theophylaktos was born circa 1050 in the Euripos region of Euboea, in the Theme of Hellas. He received his primary education in his hometown and probably also at nearby Athens, as Archbishop Symeon of Bulgaria maintains. Theophylaktos then moved to Constantinople

1. See Quasten, *Patrology* I 220–8, II 246–340, esp. 320–2, III 384–96, esp. 385–6.
2. J. Pelikan, *Christianity and Classical Culture* (New Haven, CT 1993), esp. 3–21.
3. Ibid. esp. 9–12.

Byzantine Macedonia. Identity Image and History. Edited by John Burke & Roger Scott (*Byzantina Australiensia* 13, Melbourne 2000).

where he received his higher education under Michael Psellos, the ὕπατος τῶν φιλοσόφων ('the supreme of all philosophers').[1]

In Constantinople he became acquainted with members of the imperial court and served as tutor of the prince Constantine Doukas, son of Emperor Michael VII Doukas (1071–8), and of the sons of other prominent Constantinopolitan families. Following his ordination to the priesthood, he served as deacon of Hagia Sophia. In 1088/9 he was elected to episcopal rank and during the same year was appointed Archbishop of Achrida. This city of Byzantine Macedonia was built on the site of ancient Lychnidos, whose citizens spoke Greek and claimed descent from the Bacchiadae, who had fled to the north from Corinth in the seventh century before the Christian era.

By the eleventh century of our era, however, Achrida had changed hands and was composed of a mixed population. It had served as the capital of the Bulgarian tzar Samuel (987/8–996/7) and as the see of an autocephalous Bulgarian archbishopric until it was recovered by the Byzantine emperor Basil II (976–1025) and came once again under Byzantine rule. The fact that many people welcomed Basil as a liberator from Bulgarian rule[2] indicates that Achrida must have had a large number of native Greek-speaking people besides Bulgarians and Slavs.

Theophylaktos was one of the best educated churchmen of Macedonia in the Byzantine era and perhaps in the whole millennium, trained in both sacred and profane learning. His commentaries on Christian Scriptures are consulted by scholars to the present day. The use of the Scriptures in his other writings, such as encomia, panegyrics, polemics and especially epistles, commend him as an expert exegete and a faithful student of the Bible. He wrote commentaries on 26 books of the New Testament and on the 12 minor prophets of the Old Testament. Equally valuable for biblical studies are the numerous passages, paraphrases and illustrations from nearly every book of the whole biblical corpus, including the Apocalypse of John and the Deuterocanonical books, with which he embellished his epistles. The books of the Psalms and the prophet Isaiah were his favorite Old Testament books. From the New Testament he used the Gospels of Matthew and Luke and the Letters of Paul to the Corinthians extensively to enrich his correspondence.

Theophylaktos was a polymath but not an original thinker. As a biblical exegete he relied on Clement of Alexandria, Methodios of Olympus, Cyril of Alexandria, Dionysios the Pseudo-Areopagite, the Cappadocian Fathers, Oikoumenios of Trike, Euthymios Zygabinos, and especially John Chrysostom. In

---

1. V. Georgiades, "Μνημεῖα Ἐκκλησιαστικὰ Ἀνέκδοτα ἐκ τῶν τοῦ Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Βουλγαρίας Θεοφυλάκτου" *EkAl* 4 no. 8 (Constantinople 1883) 109–116, 135–8, 141–3; id., 5 (1884–5) 11–13; R. Katičić, "Βιογραφικὰ περὶ Θεοφυλάκτου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Ἀχρίδος" *EEBS* 30 (1960–1) 364–85; R. Janin, "Θεοφύλακτος ὁ Ἥφαιστος" *ThEE* 6 (Athens 1965) cols. 417–9; D. Xanalatos, "Θεοφύλακτος ὁ Βουλγαρίας καὶ ἡ δρᾶσις αὐτοῦ ἐν Ἀχρίδι" *Theologia* 16 (1938) 228–40; Vasiliev, *History* 496–7, including note 378.
2. Theoph.Achrid. I 11–37, esp. 36–7; Cedr. II 468.

his exegesis as a rule he followed the historical method, although he also used the allegorical method.[1]

But, as already indicated, Theophylaktos was more than a student of the Bible. Under Michael Psellos he received an excellent training in Greek philosophy, poetry and literature. His letters reveal a familiarity with Greek mythology and the Greek intellectual tradition in general. The numerous passages, paraphrases, onomatology, proverbs and mythological allusions from the classical Greek corpus which embellish his epistles are not epideictic rhetoric but rather an overflow of digested knowledge of Greek learning. Theophylaktos knew the Greek classics and was proud that he was born in glorious Hellas. In a letter addressed to his students, he exclaimed that he was a product of fortunate Hellas (Ἑλλάδος ὢν ἐκείνης τῆς εὐδαίμονος βλάστημα).[2] But whether he had studied in Athens before he moved to Constantinople is still disputed. In his correspondence he laments the fact that he has to be away from the capital to serve a provincial diocese with a mixed but illiterate population composed mainly of Bulgars, Slavs and Greeks.[3] A few illustrations will substantiate our observations.

In a letter written from Achrida in 1088/9 to a palace dignitary (the officer ἐπὶ τῶν δεήσεων) Theophylaktos is biting, and writes about the people he serves with a sense of deep disappointment: "It is in the middle of such monsters (τέρασι) that I am condemned to live, and the worst part of it is that there is no hope that these [thick] necks may some day receive a head with some superior intelligence so that friendship, according to the wise man of Akragas, may bring imperfect heads [minds] to perfection."[4] The wise man of Akragas he refers to is the philosopher Empedocles. Whether Theophylaktos quotes him directly from an original manuscript or from Aristotle's Περὶ ψυχῆς 3.6 is difficult to say. He expresses similar complaints in a letter addressed to Caesar Nikephoros Melissenos, calling upon him to set him free from an unpleasant environment and citing Pindar's Ode xii where the poet speaks of the daughter of Zeus "who sets people free."[5]

Theophylaktos was not an exception in his complaints about the conditions prevailing in his diocese. Other highly educated bishops of the Byzantine era assigned to provincial towns suffered from culture shock and complained of their assignments, bishops such as John Apokaukos of Naupaktos, Michael Choniates of Athens, Pediatites of Kerkyra, Nicholas Mouzalon of Cyprus, and John Mavropous of Euchaita.

Theophylaktos' correspondence however indicates that he experienced a conflict between his desire to be in Constantinople among cultivated people and his pastoral duty to stay close to his flock in Achrida. He may have used unkind

1. D.S. Balanos, *Οἱ Βυζαντινοὶ Ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ Συγγραφεῖς* (Athens 1951) 87–90, esp. 88; K. Krumbacher, *GBL* tr. Soteriades I 262–7, II 113–5; Beck, *Kirche* 649–51.
2. Gautier, I 131.
3. Xanalatos, loc.cit. 236–7; Katičić, loc.cit. 373 n. 5. Both works use the same original sources.
4. Theophylaktos, Ep. 6 (Gautier II 147–9).
5. Ibid. Ep. 13 (Gautier 171–3).

epithets to describe them ('rude', 'wild' and 'dull') but he nevertheless exerted every effort to improve their economic conditions. He protested against the harsh and unscrupulous manner of tax collectors and appealed to the civic authorities for more lenient taxation measures for his poorer subjects. Not only did he remain faithful to his assignment but stayed close to his flock until the day of his death sometime after 1126. He also wrote letters to fellow bishops in similar circumstances advising them to remain patiently in their positions and do their utmost for the spiritual, social and intellectual benefit of their people.[1] Pastoral duties prevailed over his intellectual interests.

Faced with the harsh conditions in Achrida and the lack of educated people, Theophylaktos often found consolation in his books and in his correspondence with fellow bishops, imperial dignitaries, and members of the imperial house such as Despoina Kyra Maria, the wife of Emperor Michael VII Doukas, Andreas Komnenos, the brother of Alexios Komnenos, and the Grand Domestikos Niketas, the teacher of the Great Church, to name a few. But sometimes even his books could not free him from the pain he felt among uneducated people.[2] In a letter to the Grand Domestikos written from Achrida c. 1088/9 Theophylaktos concludes: "I am not the slave of a rich queen, fit, clean, and beautiful, a type of golden Aphrodite, but rather of uncultivated people, dirty, who exhale the stench of the skin of sheep and who are as poor in assets as they are rich in wickedness or rather who are in control of everything at all times thanks to their poverty of assets and their wickedness. Free me from this shameful slavery, you who can, otherwise I shall disappear from your sight before the time ordained by God."[3]

B

Whether Theophylaktos was sent to Achrida in order to educate its citizens and instruct them in the faith or as punishment from his antagonists in the capital is a controversial question. In a letter to the Empress Maria he indicates that he left Constantinople reluctantly and that he viewed his appointment in Achrida as a punishment where his "many sins" (a *topos* in Byzantine religious literature) multiplied.[4] Theophylaktos' letters from Achrida are of three types: first, those addressed to imperial dignitaries, civil or military personalities, which include the most references, passages, paraphrases and allusions from classical Greek authors as well as proverbs and mythological references; second, letters sent to ecclesiastical personalities, which are embellished with quotations from the Scriptures rather than from classical masters; third, those addressed to the Empress Maria and his "disorderly" students, which use scriptural and classical quotations interchangeably.

The question is: did Theophylaktos quote directly and verbatim from his sources or did he paraphrase indirectly from memory? In his letter to the Empress

1. Xanalatos, loc.cit. 231.
2. Theophylaktos, Ep. 71 (Gautier II 283–5).
3. Ibid. Ep. 5 (Gautier II 143–5).
4. Ibid. Ep. 4 (Gautier II 137–45, esp. 137).

Maria he paraphrases Aristophanes' *Wasps* 516: "Mocked by men you all but worship, for you cannot their treachery see." His quotation from Psalm 111.10 is changed slightly, using a singular for a plural, 'sinner' rather than 'sinners'.[1] In a letter to an unidentified person he opens with a slightly re-arranged quote from Euripides' *The Phoenician Maidens* 920, in which Teiresias says "He is no longer the same man because he changed his mind." Theophylaktos starts with ὁδ' ἀνὴρ οὐκέθ' αὐτός while the original opens with ἀνὴρ ὅδ' οὐκέθ' αὐτός. His quotation οὔτε θεὸν οὔτ' ἀνέρα τίειν εἶδος is a paraphrase of Homer's *Iliad* 9.238–39: οὐδέ τι τίει ἀνέρας οὐδὲ θεούς. It speaks of Hektor's great pride in his strength which "gives way to neither god nor man".[2]

In his letter to Kamateropoulos,[3] Theophylaktos starts paraphrasing the words of the Homeric Achilles (*Iliad* 22.389–90) who says that he will not forget Patroklos even in Hades: εἰ δὲ θανόντων περ καταλήθοντ' εἰν Ἀΐδαο / αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ κεῖθι φίλου μεμνήσομ' ἑταίρου ('Though the dead forget the dead in the house of Hades, even there I shall still remember my beloved companion').

In his letter to Nicholas Mermentopoulos, Theophylaktos has a direct quotation from Homer's *Odyssey* 16.187. He opens his letter with Odysseus's response to Telemachos who perceived his father as a god: οὔ τίς τοι θεός εἰμι· τί μ' ἀθανάτοισιν ἐΐσκεις; ('I am no god. Why compare me with the immortals?')[4]

In addition to his wide use of the Scriptures and classical Greek authors, Theophylaktos used Greek mythology extensively for didactic purposes. He writes that one should avoid Phaedon's *hybris* in trying to reach the heights of heaven because like Phaedon one will be destroyed. Instead, one must imitate the prudence of Deukalion who sought refuge in an ark and was saved from the flood. He viewed the period in which Kronos reigned as a golden age, happy and without sorrows.[5] In an epistle to his students about the nature of the human body, its sufferings and illnesses, Theophylaktos writes τί δέ μοι τὸ σῶμα, ὁ σύνοικος νεκρός, ὁ ἑαυτὸν φέρων τάφος ('And what to say of the body, that corpse dwelling in the same house, the tomb that carries itself') so exploiting the idea of the body as a tomb, an idea that goes back at least as far as Plato but which was also later exploited by Neoplatonists and the Church Fathers. He then cites Hesiod's *Works and Days* 102–3 verbatim: νοῦσοι δ' ἀνθρώποισιν ἐφ' ἡμέρῃ, αἳ δ' ἐπὶ νυκτὶ / αὐτόματοι φοιτῶσι ('Illnesses come to men uninvited, some during the day and others during the night'), as well as making use of Galen. Later in the same letter he turns to ancient history (παλαιὰς ἱστορίας) refering to Athens, Alcibiades, Kallias, Aristophanes, Lysandros, the Lakedaimonians, Lykourgos' laws, the

1. Ibid. 139: Theophylaktos writes ἐπιθυμία ἁμαρτωλοῦ ἀπολεῖται while the original speaks of ἐπιθυμία ἁμαρτωλῶν ἀπολεῖται.
2. Ibid. Ep. 6 (Gautier II 147–9).
3. Ibid. Ep. 27 (Gautier II 219–21).
4. Ibid. Ep. 29 (Gautier II 225–7).
5. Theophylaktos, "To his undisciplined students" (Gautier I 135).

wisdom of the Homeric Palamedes and the mythical land of the gloomy Cimmerians (Homer, *Odyssey* 11.15–19).

Writing about his dilemmas in his pastoral duties, Theophylaktos likens himself to a father who slaps his sons and at the same time kisses them tenderly, shuts them out of the house and again welcomes them back. Menelaos, Laestrygonians, Charybdis, Cyclops and Skylla are referred to along with references to teachings of the Bible. He cites 1 Thessalonians, 2 Corinthians, Psalms 30, 103, 108, Zachariah, Proverbs, Isaiah, Gospel of John, Hebrews, Hosea, Jeremiah, Numbers, Ephesians, Titus, 1 Corinthians and Colossians.[1] He advises his students to behave modestly so that outsiders will not accuse them of indecency; to behave in such a way as to grieve their enemies by being good and virtuous, reminding us of what Odysseus said to the Princess Nausikaa about the results of a good and happy marriage.[2]

In a second letter to his "undisciplined students",[3] Theophylaktos writes that he has adopted a milder tone in his letter so that he might not appear more cruel than the misanthropist Timon, quoting Aristophanes, "words are but a shadow to deeds" (*Birds* 1549). In the same letter he cites Homer, Hesiod, Plato, Diogenes Laertios, Herodotos, Greek mythology and epigrams, along with several books of the Bible including Genesis, Isaiah, Job, Psalms, Jeremiah, Habakkuk, Proverbs, Zachariah, Matthew, Romans and Hebrews.

Unlike his two epistles to his students, Theophylaktos' letters to religious dignitaries make much greater use of the Scriptures. In a letter to the Grand Oikonomos[4] of the Patriarchate, probably Nicholas Grammatikos (1084–1111), the brother of the Patriarch, Theophylaktos uses twenty four biblical passages from the following books: Psalms (12 passages), Isaiah, Job, Exodus, Deuteronomy, Jeremiah, 2 Corinthians, Matthew and Ephesians.

More important is his discourse (λόγος) addressed to his student the prince Kyr Constantine, the son of Michael VII Doukas.[5] While his *logos* includes 25 scriptural references and quotes and only seven from the Greek classics (Homer, Sophocles, Euripides) and proverbs, the *logos* is replete with historical persons and events from pagan antiquity. "I will not flatter my emperor, nor will I use soft words to please your ears, nor yet will I adopt a Lydian law but the severe and Dorian mode," Theophylaktos writes.[6] He goes on to indicate that he needs the sweetness of Herodotos and the precision of Aristeides in order to speak of the virtues of the prince's mother. Furthermore he cites several good or evil persons such as Cambyses and Sardanapalus, Aristeides and Epaminondas, Ares the god of war, the Minotaur, Sirens, Plato, Archimedes, Euclid, Persians and Darius, with several references to historical events. Political experiences mentioned in

1. Ibid. 135–43.
2. Ibid. 143. Homer, *Odyssey* 6.180–5.
3. Ibid. 147–65.
4. Ibid. 169–75.
5. Ibid. 179–211.
6. Ibid. 179.

Theophylaktos' *logos* reveal beyond any doubt that he was excellently versed in ancient mythology and history.[1]

In 134 epistles (edited by Paul Gautier), Theophylaktos cites fourteen classical Greek authors, including poets, philosophers and historians, as follows:

Aristophanes	six (6)
Aristotle	three (3)
Empedocles	five (5)
Euripides	ten (10)
Herodotos	two (2)
Hesiod	six (6)
Homer	sixty one (61)
Lucian	two (2)
Lykophron of Chalkis	one (1)
Oppianos	one (1)
Pindar	five (5)
Plato	three (3)
Sophocles	four (4)
Thucydides	one (1)

In addition to these one hundred and ten references to classical authors, Theophylaktos uses fifteen ancient Greek proverbs. Some of his homilies and *logoi* are enriched with passages or paraphrases from Archilochos, Aeschylos, Simonides, Aristotle, Aristophanes, Diogenes Laertios, Euripides, Herodotos, Hesiod, Pindar, Plutarch, Plato, Sophocles and especially Homer. It is interesting to note that he uses Church Fathers sparingly, citing only Gregory the Theologian (Nazianzenos) and Synesios of Cyrene.

C

Theophylaktos remained faithful to the masters of ancient Hellas who had provided the basis of his education and had shaped his culture. His education consisted of mastering the Christian Scriptures in the same way that he had mastered his Homer and other Greek authors. Erudition was one of Theophylaktos' outstanding characteristics. He knew by heart many scriptural verses but also passages from the writings of his non-Christian ancestors. Reading and memorizing sacred and profane texts had been a normal practice of educated Church Fathers for many centuries.

The integration of Biblical and Greek classical learning that Theophylaktos had achieved was so skillfully done that it is difficult to recognize whether he had memorized or had a manuscript before his eyes. The Psalter and Homer are quoted more frequently than any other sacred and profane source. In the Psalter, quoted more than 200 times, Theophylaktos found a book which had long been accepted as having universal religious significance. Long before Theophylaktos, many Greek Church Fathers were able to discern in the Psalter not only inspiring poetry but also

1. Ibid. 193.

references to Christ and teachings that suggested the inclusion of all humanity in God's plans for salvation. In the Greek classics he found a *propaideia* for Christianity, a natural theology in agreement with Christian theology, something that had been emphasized by the Cappadocians.

Theophylaktos' attitude toward the classical Greek heritage is in full agreement with the inherited patristic tradition. The Church Fathers considered that although the ancient Greeks were in religious error, they were nevertheless their ancestors. For the educated among them, the mind and ethos of ancient Hellenism was never static, irrelevant and incomprehensible, but always alive and evolving, adapting itself to the needs of every century. For them there was no discontinuity in time between ancient and medieval Hellenism, but continuity which in the process had achieved an *alleloperichoresis*, an inter-relationship, a consummation and metamorphosis that led to the formation of Christian Hellenism.

Theophylaktos' attitude toward the Greek classics and his commitment to Christian Scriptures illustrate once more the interrelationship that existed between sacred and profane learning. He was well-versed in both and regretted the absence of Greek learning among his subjects. In his biography of Clement, the bishop of Bulgaria, Theophylaktos praises him because he made "the wall of ignorance" of the Bulgarian priests crumble. "Knowing the coarseness of the people, their utter dullness in comprehending the Scriptures, and seeing that many Bulgarian priests were slow to understand writing in Greek," Clement invented some means to educate his people. Furthermore Clement "gave another benefit to the land [Bulgaria] by bringing over from the country of the Greeks all kinds of cultivated orchard trees. By engrafting, he turned the wild trees into orchard trees."[1]

The introduction of learning and the improvement of life among the Slavic peoples, including those in Byzantine Macedonia, were some of the major contributions of men like Clement, Constantine-Cyril, Methodios, and Theophylaktos of Achrida.

---

1. Theophylaktos of Achrida, *Βίος καὶ πολιτεία ἡ τοῦ Κλήμεντος Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Βουλγαρίας* ed. J.P. Migne, PG 126 cols. 1194–1240. For the Eng. tr. by S. Nikolov see I. Duichev, *Kiril and Methodius* (New York 1985) esp. 118–9.

Rosemary Morris

The Athonites and their neighbours in Macedonia in the tenth and eleventh centuries

One of the most important principles in Byzantine monasticism was *eremia* (solitude) and the Holy Mountain of Athos in Macedonia was originally a place where ascetics could seek that solitude. By the end of the ninth century there were many monastic groups and solitaries on the mountain, and from this time date the earliest written records detailing their relations with each other and with their lay neigbours. These documents, the so-called archives of Mt. Athos, are slowly but surely being published, monastery by monastery, by French scholars and provide the major source for the history of the Athonite monasteries in the Byzantine period.[1]

In the tenth century, with the foundation of the Great Lavra by St. Athanasios the Athonite, actively supported by the Emperor Nikephoros II Phocas, a new era dawned in the history of Athonite monasticism. Lavish amounts of imperial patronage in the form of annual donations of money (*rogai*) and grants of privileges were given, particularly to the Lavra and to the Monastery of Iveron.[2] This house for Georgian monks was founded by the father and son Sts. John and Euthymios and was financed by imperial generosity and, it must be added, by the booty gained by the Georgian general John Tornik (later the monk John the Synkellos) when he emerged from Iveron to lead Georgian forces to the rescue of the young emperors, Basil II and Constantine VIII, from rebellions in Anatolia in 978–9.[3] It was this influx of wealth and the growth of imperial approval which allowed the Athonites in general (and these two houses in particular) both to improve their own buildings

---

1. See R. Morris, "The Origins of Athos" *Mount Athos and Byzantine Monasticism* ed. A. Bryer & M. Cunningham (*Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies, Publications* 4, Aldershot 1996) 37–46. The *Archives de l'Athos* are published by a team based at the Collège de France, Paris. With some 15 volumes already published, the enterprise is over half way to its completion.
2. For the life and achievements of St. Athanasios of Athos see *Vitae Athanasii*; *Lavra* I, Introduction; *Prot.* Introduction 22–31. For donations of *rogai* (annual payments) and *solemnia* (diverted fiscal revenues) see R. Morris, *Monks and Laymen in Byzantium* (Cambridge 1995) Table 4. By 1057 the Lavra received 2,232 *nomismata* each year from imperial donations alone, see *Lavra* I no. 32. Before 1079 the Monastery of Iviron had received a total of 592 *nomismata per annum*, of which 288 had been suppressed at some time before that year, cf. *Ivir.* II no. 41 (1079).
3. For Sts. John and Euthymios see B. Martin-Hisard, "La *Vie de Jean et Euthyme* et le statut du Monastère des Ibères sur l'Athos" *REB* 49 (1991) 67–142, tr. of *Life* 84–134. The early history of Iviron is discussed in *Ivir.* I 3–102; for a shorter summary see J. Lefort and D. Papachryssanthou, "Les premiers Géorgiens à l'Athos dans les documents byzantins" *Bedi Kartlisa* 41 (1983) 27–33. John Tornik's career is discussed in *Ivir.* I 15–16; see also J.-C. Cheynet, *Pouvoir et contestations à Byzance (963–1210)* (*Byzantina Sorbonensia* 9, Paris 1990) 28, 330–1.

Byzantine Macedonia. Identity Image and History. Edited by John Burke & Roger Scott (*Byzantina Australiensia* 13, Melbourne 2000).

and property on the holy mountain itself and to acquire lands and influence further afield. In doing so, they naturally came into contact —and, indeed, conflict — with their secular neighbours and it is some of these relationships which are the subject of the present paper.

At the root of the difficulties lay the remarkable increase in the numbers of monks on Mt. Athos. By the mid-eleventh century, the monastic population ran into thousands. Although St. Athanasios had originally stipulated that his *lavra* should only contain eighty monks, he later allowed for forty more. By 1030 the Great Lavra contained 700 monks and an act of 1102 speaks of a 'great increase in monks', though did not specify how many. It is possible that there were over a thousand monks associated with this one house by the end of the eleventh century; some living in the *lavra*, some deputed to live on and organise its estates beyond the mountain.[1] Iveron similarly saw a great increase in vocations: by c. 1008 there were 300 monks in the monastery.[2] Even in a more modest Athonite establishment which fell on hard times during the eleventh century — the Monastery of Xenophontos — monastic numbers in 1083, *before* its 'refoundation', were some 55 monks.[3] Given this remarkable expansion in numbers it was inevitable that the monastic houses of Athos should seek to expand their property holdings beyond the mountain itself. For much of Athos was unsuited to agrarian exploitation; vineyards, gardens and small olive groves were carved out around the monasteries themselves, but there was no possibility of the large-scale production that was needed to feed even frugal monastic communities of the size we find in the eleventh century. The problem was already evident by the end of the tenth: the monk Nicholas, the author of a hagiography of the ninth-century St. Peter the Athonite, writing c. 970–80, commented on the regrettable desire of the Athonites of his own time for possession and expansion.[4]

The Athonites, however, had little choice but to use their new found wealth to acquire land which would supply adequate amounts of three basic commodities — wine, olive oil and grain — to their burgeoning communities. Although it appears that Athos was self-sufficient in wine at the end of the tenth century, since the so-called *Tragos* of the Emperor John Tzimiskes (970–2) legislated against selling surplus wine to the laity living beyond the boundary of the Holy Mountain, it is unlikely that this was the case in the eleventh.[5] Certainly, in the case of both Lavra and Iveron, the accumulation of vineyards in the Chalkidike indicates an awareness of the need to acquire productive properties. Lavra, for instance, acquired vineyards at Pisson (present-day Pisona) when it took over the Monastery of St. Andrew at Peristerai (Peristera) and exchanged two vineyards at Sykea for two others on the

1. *Lavra* I nos. 27 (1030), 55 (1102).
2. Life of Sts. John and Euthymios ch. 26 (Martin-Hisard 108).
3. *Xénoph.* no. 1 (1083).
4. *Prot.* 71.
5. *Prot.* no. 7 (970–2) lines 95–100. The *Tragos* or 'goat' was a *typikon* (regulatory document) so called because it was written on a large piece of goat-skin parchment.

peninsula of Longos (present-day Sithonia).[1] In the case of Iveron, the mobilisation of the monastery's considerable liquid assets allowed it to gain possession of a productive vineyard at Thessalonikea on the peninsula of Platys on the north coast of the Holy Mountain, even in the face of opposition from many of the other Athonite houses. But in the course of day-long negotiations with the Protos of Athos and the representatives of the other monasteries, the *hegoumenos* of Iveron (by this time Euthymios, son of the founder) had to raise his offer from 34 *nomismata* to 200 *nomismata*. The Georgians clearly wanted this particular vineyard (the document concerned records that Euthymios had specifically asked for it) and their wealth allowed them to obtain it, even at an inflated price.[2]

The same sort of pattern is visible in the acquistion of grain and olive-growing lands by the more prosperous Athonite monasteries. Whilst we do hear of the planting of olive groves on the mountain, such as those undertaken by the second 'founder' of the Monastery of Xenophontos, Symeon the Sanctified, only those monasteries with lands beyond the mountain would have been self-sufficient in oil. In other cases, supplies would have had to have been augmented from the open market. This was even more true for grain and the necessity of obtaining the vast amounts needed to feed the monks of the larger monasteries was the main reason for Athonite expansion into the region around Hierissos, into the Chalkidike and further afield into southern Macedonia.[3]

The expansion of monastic land-holding into the Chalkidike can be explained by the need to make use of the more varied opportunities that this area afforded for agriculture and animal husbandry. The two peninsulas to the west of Athos, Kassandra and Longos, possessed both arable and pastoral lands and supported other activities such as bee-keeping.[4] But the acquisition of lands on the coastal plain from Serres to Constantinople meant the possession of lands in one of the most important agricultural areas of the empire. The most striking feature of the process was the speed at which Athonite houses gained property far away from the Holy Mountain. By the mid-tenth century, the Lavra held lands at Chrysoupolis; by the end of the eleventh, its lands could be found on the outskirts of Thessaloniki in one direction to estates in Derkos (mod. Durusu, formerly Terkoz, in European Turkey) on the other.[5] Iveron, basking in imperial favour at the beginning of the eleventh century, was able with the support of the Emperor Basil II to gain control

1. *Lavra* I no. 1 (987) for Pisson; *Lavra* I no. 24 (1018): vineyards at Longos. For the historical geography of the regions concerned, see J. Lefort, *Villages de Macédoine* I: *La Chalcidique occidentale* (TM 1, Paris 1982).
2. *Ivir.* I nos. 20 and 21, both drawn up on 19th April, 1015.
3. *Xénoph.* no. 1 (1089).
4. See Lefort, *Villages de Macédoine* and J. Koder, "Die Metochia der Athos-Klöster auf Sithonia und Kassandreia" *JÖB* 16 (1967) 211–24.
5. Hendy, *Economy* 85–90 and map 19, discusses the interest of both secular magnates and monastic houses in obtaining lands on the coastal plains of Macedonia and Thrace in the 11th century. For the location of Derkos see M. Kaplan, "In search of St. Cyril's Philea", *Work and Worship at the Theotokos Evergetis, 1050–1200* ed. M. Mullett & A. Kirby (*Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations* 6.2, Belfast 1997) 213–221, 216.

of the Monastery of Kolobos near Hierissos and with it estates nearby, more lands near Kassandra and in the Western Chalkidike and, most importantly, property in the valley of the River Strymon (mod. Struma) near Ezoba.[1] By the end of the eleventh century the Lavra's properties in the Macedonian theme of Boleron-Strymon-Thessaloniki amounted to about 47,052 *modioi* (about 4,705 h); those of Iveron were about 80,000 *modioi* (about 8,000 h)[2]

There is no doubt, then, that Athonite monasteries became major landowners in Macedonia because this was the most obvious area for expansion if they wished to obtain more land to feed their monastic populations. But although much of the property was acquired by purchase, a considerable amount was gained through donation. Iveron, for example, gained the important Radolibos estate (modern Rodolibos in Eastern Macedonia) as a bequest from two Georgians, Symbatios Pakourianos (who was to be buried at Iveron) and his wife Kale, and there are many other examples of small to medium donations of land, all of which helped to build up the holdings of the monasteries concerned.[3]

What were the consequences of the increased Athonite 'presence' beyond the Holy Mountain? One of the most interesting, which certainly demands further research, is the possible 'diversion' of patronage from already existing churches and monasteries towards the houses on Mt. Athos, increasingly influential both in spiritual and political terms. Why, for example, when a new house for Georgian monks had recently been founded at Bačkovo (in present-day Southern Bulgaria) in 1083 by Gregory Pakourianos, did members apparently of his own kin choose to donate their property to Iveron? An older house, perhaps, or one with a stronger spiritual pedigree, having been founded by two Georgian saints?[4] Certainly one which had clearly established itself as a focal point for the increasing numbers of Georgians settled in the Empire in the eleventh century. The same kind of spiritual 'focussing' is evident when we consider donations to the other Athonite houses, and it must at least be suggested that the local houses of Macedonia may well have been deprived of important sources of patronage by the growing power of Athos.

This, however, needs further investigation. What is rather clearer are a number of issues which brought the Athonites into conflict with their neighbours. Firstly, the tenth-century establishment of a frontier between Athos and the lay world, which could only be crossed by the laity at times of emergency — such as 'barbarian' attack — was, in itself an encroachment on the long-held lay rights of communal pasture on the mountain. So from 943 onwards, Mt. Athos remained a place where laymen were only admitted on sufferance; the previous structure of the *koinosis* (communal holding) of Hierissos and its region had been irrevocably

1. For a detailed discussion of Iviron's property acquisitions in this period see *Ivir.* I 25–59 and II 70–91.
2. See Morris, *Monks and Laymen* 228–9.
3. *Ivir.* II nos. 44 (1090), 46 (1093), 47 (1098), 48 (1098), 51 (1103) for the Pakourianos bequest; also J. Lefort, "Radolibos: population et paysage" *TM* 9 (1985) 195–234.
4. For the establishment of the Georgian monastery at Bachkovo see P. Gautier, "Le typikon du sébaste Grégoire Pakourianos" *REB* 42 (1964 = 'Pakourianos') 5–145.

altered.[1] Since the alteration had been effected by imperial decree, there was nothing the lay inhabitants could do about it. This kind of situation, admittedly rare, was a direct consequence of the increasing imperial patronage of Athonite houses.

But a second, more frequent source of conflict was the growing power of their considerable disposable income. In particular, the larger Athonite houses were able to intervene in the land market almost at will. We have seen how the monks of Iveron could increase their offer for a coveted vineyard on Athos itself almost seven-fold in the course of one day; there are other examples which illustrate the ability of the monks to 'outbid' their lay neighbours in competition for land. This was particularly evident in competition for the possession of *klasma* lands. These were lands which had, for some reason (in the case of Macedonia in this period, usually Slav, Bulgar or Norman raiding), been abandoned by their previous owners, had then been subjected to a lightening of tax (*sympatheia)* and finally, after thirty years' abandonment, had reverted to the state for re-sale. Possession of them was advantageous for a number of reasons: the price to be paid was to be not more than twenty-four times the tax on the land before it had been abandoned; the tax initially to be paid while the land was brought back into cultivation was to be only one twelfth of the original tax; and the land could often speedily be restored to full production by those, such as monasteries, which had access to adequate supplies of manpower. In some cases it had never ceased to be cultivated even though its ownership had been unclear. Thus land which had been cheaply acquired and, for some time at least, was only subject to a light fiscal burden, could provide a productive investment.[2]

So when large-scale sales of *klasma* were made in 941–2, the Monastery of St. Andrew of Peristerai, later possessed by the Great Lavra, was able to purchase properties on the peninsula of Kassandra amounting to some 1,800 *modioi* (of which 1,200 *modioi* were already again under cultivation), whereas a single private individual, one Nicholas 'son of Agathon' could only afford to bid for 100 *modioi* in the same region.[3] In another case, the Athonite Monastery of Xeropotamou was able to buy up 950 *modioi* of *klasma* lands from a group of peasants who had been able to find the original purchase price of 19 *nomismata* between them, but, when the land was re-assessed and the price doubled, clearly could not manage the extra sum. The monastery was easily able to find the extra 19 *nomismata* demanded by

1. See *Prot.* nos. 5 and 6 (943) and, for a more detailed discussion, R. Morris, "Dispute settlement in the Byzantine provinces in the tenth century" *The Settlement of Disputes in Early Medieval Europe* ed. W. Davies & P. Fouracre (Cambridge 1986) 125–47.
2. *Klasma* lands and their exploitation are discussed in A. Harvey, *Economic expansion in the Byzantine empire* (Cambridge 1989) 67–9; N. Oikonomides, "Das Verfalland im 10.–11. Jahrhundert. Verkauf und Besteuerung" *Fontes Minores* 8 (*Forschungen zur Byzantinischen Rechtsgeschichte* 14, Frankfurt 1986) 116–18, rp. *Byzantium from the ninth century* 5; and, importantly, M. Kaplan, *Les hommes et la terre à Byzance du VIe au XIe siècle. Propriété et exploitation du sol* (*Byzantina Sorbonensia* 10, Paris 1992) 399–408.
3. *Lavra* I nos. 2 (941), 3 (941), where the purchase of Nicholas is mentioned; *Prot.* no. 4 (942).

the state and thus gained land which had already been brought back into use.[1] The Athonites, therefore, were able to make use of their financial assets to change the nature of land-holding, initially in the region of Hierissos but, increasingly, further and further afield. The phenomenon of the powerful landowner was not, of course, a new one in Byzantine Macedonia, but there was a marked difference in what could be achieved by powerful *institutions*.

All the more significant, however, is the fact that the Athonite expansion beyond the Holy Mountain was beginning to take place at precisely the period in the mid-tenth century at which imperial legislation professed itself concerned about the activities of *dynatoi* ('powerful'), amongst whom were numbered the heads of monastic houses.[2] In many cases, the monasteries of Athos were 'powerful' precisely because imperial patronage had made them so by providing gifts of money and exemptions from taxation for their workforce and by confirmation of their privileged territorial position, so the paradox is particularly striking. It is a matter to which we shall return.

A third area of conflict between the Athonites and their neighbours was the perennial problem of disputes centred on landholding, the *raison d'être* of many of the documents preserved in the Athonite archives. In many of these conflicts it is clear that two major advantages aided the Athonites in their endeavours. One was the institutional advantage already mentioned — monasteries did not die like individual landowners; the second, of significant importance to some but not all Athonite houses, was their relationship with the imperial power.

A case from the Iveron archive illustrates how local disputes over land and the payment of dues on it could take on a whole new dimension if they involved houses which enjoyed imperial favour. In 982, recalled an Iveron document, the inhabitants of Hierissos had long clashed with the monks of the Monastery of Kolobos (taken over by Iveron in 979–80) and had often had recourse to local judges, to provincial governors (*strategoi*) and even to judges in Constantinople.[3] Each side had won and lost cases, but they were now on good terms. The agreement that was being made in 982 was, in fact, the settlement of an extremely long-running dispute which had, as its origin, the refusal of the Hierissiotes to pay land tax for land they rented from Kolobos at Gradiska at the gates of their town. The case went to court in 927 and was heard by the judge of the theme of Thessaloniki, Samonas, as was all right and proper. The status of the land was again in question in 942–3 when it was involved in the negotiations centred on the establishment of the Athonite frontier and was, in fact, granted to the Hierissiotes in return for other parcels of land (and payments) which suited the Athonites better. What turned up in the course of this settlement was the fact (related in 982) that there were other

1. *Xérop.* no. 1 (956).
2. For the identification of *dynatoi* in the mid 950s see R. Morris, "The Powerful and the Poor in tenth-century Byzantium: Law and Reality, *P&P* 73 (1976) 3–27; and Kaplan, *Les hommes et la terre* 429–36.
3. The Monastery of Kolobos dedicated to St. John Prodromos, though not technically on the Holy Mountain, lay between it and the town of Hierissos. On its history see *Prot.* 36–40.

Kolobos lands on the peninsula of Longos which were claimed by the inhabitants of Hierissos who had leased them for 29 years and had then wished to buy them, a request which had been refused by the then *hegoumenos* of Kolobos. This time the dispute had gone all the way up the judicial chain to Constantinople. In about 958 the Emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos instructed an imperial official, one Constantine Karamallos, to leave his post in Thessaloniki and investigate these continuing problems. Eventually, in 982 a settlement was reached by which the Hierissiotes were allowed by the monks of Iveron to keep the lands on Longos but to offer other properties in exchange. These estates were very near lands which Iveron had gained near Hierissos itself and clearly helped to consolidate the monks' property holdings in that region.[1]

A number of interesting conclusions may be drawn from this somewhat tangled tale. The care with which the monks of Iveron investigated, and were able to pursue, any property claims outstanding on behalf of their new dependency of Kolobos testifies not only to the superior record keeping of the latter institution, but also the determination of the Georgian monks to trace and claim all possible assets. They were able to do this not only because the Kolobos monks before them had had the means to appeal to Constantinople but also because, by 982, they themselves were basking in imperial approval. Even though the Hierissiotes had banded together to pursue their case (and this example of communal activity is itself interesting), the fact that the Iveron monks and their predecessors at Kolobos could take simple land disputes way beyond the local thematic courts in which they should have been heard, right up to the imperial judges in Constantinople, is proof of the practical benefits which accrued from imperial patronage in cash and in concern.

This is not to say that matters always went in favour of the Athonites. Again as a consequence of the 'following up' of the estates of Kolobos that took place after 980, the Georgians determined to sort out once and for all the disputes that were occurring between them (as the heirs of Kolobos) and the villagers of Siderokausia (to the north of Hierissos). Both groups owned lands in the nearby region of Belikradou and Arsenikea; there were complaints that the monks were allowing their animals to trample the crops of the laity and, more seriously had laid claim to lands which did not belong to them. Even more seriously, they had brought in *paroikoi* (dependent peasants) of their own to work the disputed lands and had installed mills on land which was not theirs. Again we see groups of villagers banding together to take on monastic institutions since individuals were unlikely to have much success. Indeed, it is possible that some of the property concerned was actually jointly held by the men of Siderokausia. Interestingly, the monks do not seem to have carried all before them in this particular case. For the judge who heard it, Nicholas, the thematic *krites* of Strymon and Thessaloniki, knew a thing or two about monks. Certainly, he wrote in his judgement, they had need of material sustenance so that the body could come to the aid of the soul, but, he added, 'it

1. See *Ivir.* I nos. 1 (927) and 4 (982) for the disputes.

sometimes happens that material necessities lead them to do wrong to their neighbours'.[1]

The outcome of this particular case should act as a warning against the assumption that the Athonite monks were always able to triumph over their lay neighbours. Indeed, it would also be wrong to assume that relationships between them were always strained, for medieval documents were almost always drawn up to settle disputes or confirm rights, rarely to report the unsung acts of day to day co-operation and co-existence which, we must assume, also took place. But there is enough evidence in the Athonite archives strongly to suggest that these houses may have enjoyed advantages denied their neighbours, however influential the latter may have been.

We know, for instance, of at least two powerful laymen who received a great deal of imperial patronage at the end of the eleventh century. One was Gregory Pakourianos whose distinguished military career earned him the reward of considerable estates near Stenimachos in the Rhodope Mountains (including Bačkovo); in the Stephaniana region to the south of Serres, and around Mosynopolis (6 km. west of present day Kumetzena on the Thracian coast). In 1083 he founded the Georgian Monastery at Bačkovo but was killed in action against the Petchenegs (probably in 1086) before he could enter it.[2] The other was Leo Kephalas, rewarded by both the Emperors Nikephoros III Botaneiates (1078–81) and Alexios I Komnenos (1081–1118) for sterling services to the state, not the least of which was the successful defence of the town of Larissa against the Norman Bohemond in 1082–3.[3] As recent work by Oikonomides has shown, both these gentlemen received considerable gifts of property from their grateful employers (the Kephalas estates lay near Thessaloniki, near Moglena, near Derkos and at Traïanopolis) and with them considerable privileges including exemptions from the payment of fiscal dues in both cash and kind as well as the diversion into their hands of land taxes due on these properties.[4] But even their undoubted privileges pale into insignificance when compared with those accorded to the powerful Athonite houses.

By the end of the eleventh century, in fact, it was abundantly clear to the imperial tax inspectors and collectors in Macedonia that the Great Lavra held far more land than its level of tax payment indicated was legal. In 1088–9 the *hegoumenos* stated that the monastery held 42,705 *modioi* (c. 4,270 h). When the properties (outside Athos) were measured by the judge and tax inspector Niketas Xiphilinos, it was discovered that the true extent of their estates was some 47,052

1. *Ivir.* I no. 9 (995).
2. For the career of Gregory Pakourianos, see 'Pakourianos', Introduction; and most recently, N. Oikonomides, *Fiscalité et exemption fiscale à Byzance (IXe–XIe s.)* (Athens 1996) 190–2. For the location of the properties see Asdracha, *Rhodopes.*
3. See G. Rouillard, "Un grand bénéficiaire sous Alexis Comnène: Léon Képhalas" *BZ* 30 (1930) 44–50; Oikonomides, *Fiscalité* 192–4. *Lavra* I no. 65 notes(1181) reconstitutes the 'dossier' of the Kephalas lands, most of which came into the possession of the Great Lavra on Athos.
4. Oikonomides, *Fiscalité* 190–4

modioi. After a series of fiscal manoeuvres carried out with the full consent of the Emperor Alexios Komnenos (though doubtless to the fury of the tax-farming officials involved!), the Lavra was allowed to keep the extra property and, in addition, to pay a far lower rate of tax on it than had been established as long ago as the 1040s. In addition, it is possible that they were allowed to pay in the low-value coins circulating before Alexios' currency reform of 1092, thus adding to their financial advantage.[1] This, added to the exemptions from the visitations of the officials of the *demosion* (fisc) and the right to pay what few taxes still remained directly into the *sekreton tôn oikeiakôn* (a bureau concerned with the management of state lands and with the registration of privileges) meant that they were, in theory, to be free from the general attentions of roving tax officials and, in particular, the need to feed and house them and their retinues. As Oikonomides has commented, the Lavra had achieved a 'veritable *tour de force*' unequalled by any other monastery.[2]

This is undoubtedly true, but if we glance at the fortunes of other Athonite houses in the 11th century, especially in the reign of Alexios Komnenos when, there is no doubt, imperial initiatives were succeeding in tightening up both the processes of assessment of dues and taxes payable on landed property and the means by which they were paid, it is quite clear that the 'special relationship' which they enjoyed with the imperial power helped to protect them, to some extent, from the cold fiscal winds which were now blowing through the Empire.[3]

The monks of Iveron, for example, were also able to arrange for their taxes to be paid directly to the bureau of the *genikon* (responsible for maintaining lists of tax-payers and collecting taxes) and, at least under Nikephoros Botaneiates, paid very little tax on their lands to the fisc. Things were harder under Alexios Komnenos; as a consequence again of the general review of holdings and payments that took place in Macedonia in the 1080s, they were found to be holding a surplus of land relative to the land tax paid and were forced to give up some 75,000 *modioi* of it. But c. 30,000 *modioi* was later recovered and, as we have seen, in 1103 the Georgians received the massive gifts of the estate of Radolibos, comprising 20,000 *modioi* of land and 122 dependent peasants, both of which gifts were free of all fiscal obligations.[4] In an even more extraordinary turn of events, a high-ranking imperial official, the Sevastos John Komnenos, a nephew of the emperor, devoted himself for three months at the end of 1103 to a detailed survey and measurement of all the lands of Iveron, to an examination and re-listing of all of the monastery's privileges, and to the confirmation of his findings by the relevant official bureaux

1. *Lavra* I no. 50 (1089). For a detailed account of the sharp practices employed by the monks of the Lavra, see N. Svoronos, "L'épibolè à l'époque des Comnènes" *TM* 3 (1968) 375–95, rp. Svoronos, *Études* 5. Fuller discussion in Morris, *Monks and Laymen* 284–6.
2. See Oikonomides, *Fiscalité* 197–200; 227 for the functions of the *sekreton tôn oikeiakôn*.
3. For the details of Alexios Komnenos' currency and fiscal reforms see Hendy, *Economy* 434–4, 513–7 and the differing views of C. Morrisson, "La Logarikè: réforme monétaire et réforme fiscale sous Alexis I Comnène" *TM* 7 (1979) 419–64. Harvey, *Economic expansion* ch. 3 has a cogent treatment of the major issues.
4. See *Ivir*. II 31 and Oikonomides, *Fiscalité* 200–2.

in Constantinople. It is hardly surprising that he was henceforth inscribed in the Synodikon of Iveron and allowed a special commemoration as a 'new founder', for his expertise in sorting out the affairs of the house led to a remarkably peaceful period in the landed affairs of this particular monastery in the twelfth century.[1]

If the Sevastos John Komnenos's actions helped to prevent depredations by tax officials, the actions of other members of the Komnenos family sometimes simply overturned them. In 1088–9, again as part of his investigation into Athonite land-holding, the hapless Niketas Xiphilinos confiscated two eststaes belonging to the monastery of Docheiariou. He was immediately overruled by the Dowager-Empress Anna Dalassene, the mother of Alexios Komnenos. Initially, Alexios supported his own official, but after representations by the monks in Constantinople allowed their appeal and, in addition, allowed them to go on paying 'the tax which they had always paid'. In other words, they were to be subject to no new taxes even if extra land were to be acquired in the future.[2]

It is, of course, difficult to compare the fortunes of monastic and lay landowners simply because we have so few examples of lay estates with which to make a meaningful comparison. It has, indeed, been suggested that the granting of fiscal exemptions and immunities to the laity was widespread in the eleventh century as a means of buying political support for the reigning emperor at a time of grave insecurity.[3] As things stand, there is simply not enough evidence to support such a view. Indeed, even if great lay families received as preferential a treatment as some of the great monasteries, it is unlikely that they would have been able to hold on to their gains with such tenacity as did the Athonite houses. Even the largest and legally most well-protected estates could eventually fall victim to the fragmenting processes of inheritance and dowry as well as the danger of confiscation.[4]

What ultimately distinguished the Athonites from their neighbours and allowed them to enjoy a status which even the most powerful of their lay neighbours could not enjoy, and which also seems to have removed them from the difficulty of being considered 'powerful' in the legal parlance of the tenth century, was not just the fact that they were monks. For although the monastic estate was one to be respected and admired, it did not provide an automatic right to ignore or circumvent the demands of the imperial power. Nor were all Athonite houses equally rich or influential. But those that flourished in the tenth and eleventh century had one important factor in common: they had all enjoyed imperial patronage from the outset. It did not matter whether individual emperors came and went; all holders of the imperial office shared the duty of their predecessors to uphold and protect the monastic life, and continuing the patterns of imperial patronage was, in itself, a means of demonstrating legitimacy. This in itself placed many Athonite monasteries in a powerful position. But they were also part of an

1. *Ivir.* II no. 52 (1104) and see Oikonomides, *Fiscalité*, 202.
2. *Docheiar.* no.2 (1089).
3. See J. F. Haldon, "Military administration and bureaucracy: state demands and private interests" *ByzF* 19 (1993) 53–60.
4. Oikonomides, *Fiscalité* 195.

institution that came to be seen as the microcosm of the empire itself, for just as the *oikoumene* encompassed men of every race and tongue so, too, did Athos, attracting as it did Greeks, Italians and Georgians in the tenth century and Russians and Slavs from the eleventh century onwards. It became the Holy Mountain *par excellence*, eclipsing all its other rivals, and its continued existence became a metaphor for the survival of the empire itself. It was this evolving reputation which protected the insititution of Athos against the vicissitudes of the tenth and eleventh century and meant that the protection of Athonite monasteries, even at the expense of their lay neighbours and often as a consequence of unfairness, if not injustice, towards them, remained an important imperial priority.

Triantafyllitsa Maniati-Kokkini

Clergy and laity "opponents" in claims for privileges and land from the twelfth to the fourteenth century.*

From the middle of the eleventh century until its downfall, the Byzantine state suffered a gradual decline from former excellence in many areas such as international status, defence capabilities, economic robustness and pecuniary stability. However, as is also the case in our own times, the process of the decline of a state does not necessarily coincide with the economic decline of its citizens; rather the opposite is true. This was the case in Byzantium: as the financial position of the state continued to worsen, many wealthy bodies — whether private citizens or legal entities — became wealthier with the "blessings" of the state. The Byzantine state, or the Byzantine Emperor himself, granted them increasingly more privileges of an economic nature either by choosing to show favour or by giving in to the on-going demands of powerful citizens for extra concessions.

Whether direct or indirect, most of these state grants were either *exkousseiai* (tax exemptions) or *oikonomiai* (temporary entitlement to the annual rent from state lands).[1] The obliging recipients or persistent claimants of these grants were Church representatives, who were usually representatives of a monastery, and members of the laity (be they military men or not) of a certain wealth and importance in the state hierarchy, and who many a time fought even amongst themselves and requested mediation by the relevant officials of the Empire or sought to have their disputes settled by the emperor himself.

The testimony of the sources gives us this general picture for almost the entire Empire, and for certain areas in particular. Macedonia,[2] an area by nature and position susceptible to such concessions and claims, features prominently in

---

* On the relationship between monasteries and laymen in general cf. P. Charanis, "The Monastic Properties and the State in the Byzantine Empire" *DOP* 4 (1948) 53–118, rp. P. Charanis, *Social, Economic and Political Life in the Byzantine Empire* (London 1973) I; Ostrogorsky, *Féodalité* 92–179; Laiou, *Peasant Society*; A. Laiou-Thomadakis, *Ἡ ἀγροτικὴ κοινωνία στὴν ὕστερη βυζαντινὴ ἐποχή* tr. A. Kasdagli (Athens 1987); J. Haldon, "Limnos, Monastic Holdings and the Byzantine State: c.1261–1453" *Continuity and Change in Late Byzantine and Early Ottoman Society* ed. A. Bryer & H. Lowry (Birmingham/Washington, D.C. 1986) 161–215. On specific subjects and persons, see the recent editions of the sources to which I refer. On persons and titles of the Palaiologan era see *PLP*.

1. During the Palaiologan period state grants constituted all the arable land of the Empire, as noted by Hélène Glykatzi–Ahrweiler, "La concession des droits incorporels, donations conditionelles ..." 12 *CEB* [Ochrid 1961] 103–114, rp. Ahrweiler, *Structures* I 113.
2. On different regions and place-names see in general J. Lefort, *Villages de Macédoine: Notices historiques et topographiques sur la Macédoine orientale au Moyen Age* I: *La Chalcidique occidentale* (Paris 1982); V. Kravari, *Villes et villages de Macédoine occidentale* (Paris 1989). For more specific information see the comments of the editors of the documents.

Byzantine Macedonia. Identity Image and History. Edited by John Burke & Roger Scott (*Byzantina Australiensia* 13, Melbourne 2000).

archival material. Many documents from the archives of monasteries on Mt. Athos and elsewhere in Macedonia have been studied. Issued by the emperor and state officials, these documents deal with the granting of rights and rents, the census (*apographe*) made from time to time, and the verification of state concessions. Naturally, as our records are drawn from monasteries, most refer primarily to monastic possessions and only secondarily to possessions of laymen (who usually have some association with the landowning monastery — it is rare for a document to refer exclusively to a lay landowner who benefited by state concessions).

Of course, of all the testimonies pertaining to Macedonia which have been considered in the treatment of our topic, it is possible to mention here only data relating to the period from the twelfth to the fourteenth century, particularly the latter, and the beginning of the fifteenth century, when the effect of important events of the previous century can still be seen.[1] Let us first analyse some documents of special significance.

A long-lasting dispute between the Megiste Lavra monastery on Mt. Athos and some of its secular neighbours is described with sufficient detail in a long but unheaded and rather unclear[2] document of November 1162,[3] which bears the signature of John Kontostephanos, the *doux* of Thessaloniki.[4] Both the monks and their neighbours were occupying *proasteia*, likely via a state grant, which were clearly delimited by a creek[5] though they had the same name ('Αρχοντοχώριον). The monastic land would have been part of the *oikonomia* of the monastery, whereas the other, as the document states, was one of the many pieces of state land which had been given to private individuals as *pronoia*. Long before the above-mentioned document was drawn up, a dispute had arisen involving the monastery and its neighbours, Andreas Romanos Rentinos and Theotimos and Leo Loukitai, who were soldiers and co-owners of the *proasteion*. Arrangements made at that time, after state intervention in December 1118,[6] provided that their *paroikoi* could cultivate part of the monastic *proasteion*, but only for the period that the three soldiers would be the owners of their own *proasteion* and on the proviso that they would not settle the shared land. However, the new owner of the *pronoia*, kyr Pankratios Anemas, not only allowed his *paroikoi* to continue cultivating part of

1. On the other hand, we have scarce evidence on the region from the twelfth century up to the end of Frankish domination, as J. Lefort notes when dealing with the property of an Athonite monastery: J. Lefort, "Une grande fortune foncière aux Xe–XIIIe siècles. Les biens du monastère d'Iviron" *Structures féodales et féodalisme dans l'Occident Méditerranéen (Xe–XIIIe siècles). Bilan et perspectives de recherches, Rome 10–13 octobre 1978* (Rome 1980) 379. Imperial documents between 1383 and 1403, when East Macedonia is in the hands of the Turks, are rare (see G. Ostrogorskij, "Autour d'un prostagma de Jean VIII Paléologue" *ZRVI* 10 (1967) 83), as well as between 1344–1355, the time of Serbian rule; in the second period, however, we have many Greek documents of Stefan Dušan mentioning imperial grants of the Byzantine state (see also infra n. 76).
2. On the main reason of confusion see infra n. 9.
3. *Lavra* I no. 64.
4. Ibid. lines 113–4 and p. 329.
5. ... καταρύακον, ὅ Τζερνάχοβα ἐπονομάζεται ... (ibid. lines 34–44 and 56–7).
6. Or in 1119. On the chronology in question, ibid. 328 and 330.

the Lavra monastery's *proasteion*, but also to settle there. Anemas certainly claims that the houses built by the *paroikoi* were already there at the time that the *proasteion* had been granted to him. The problem of the resettlement of eight *paroikoi* from the monastery in his *proasteion* following the action of a certain Koskinas[1] also remains unclear. A decision made by Kontostephanos satisfied the demands of the monastery, as its eight *paroikoi* were returned and the homes of Anemas' *paroikoi* were "removed" from the *Archontochorion* belonging to the monastery. These *paroikoi*, having been ordered (παρηγγέλθησαν ἐπιφωνηματικῶς) never to return, promised along with kyr Pankratios to obey the command (φυλάξαι τὴν παραγγελίαν).[2]

In a document dated September 1265,[3] the brothers John, Konstantinos and Michael, sons of the Pansevastos Sevastos kyr Demetrios Spartinos, confirmed and approved of the gift that their father had given to the monastery of Chilandari. In addition they also donated the remainder of the land in the same village which belonged to them. The monastery thus acquired full possession of this village, which they owned "by royal grant proclaimed in a chrysobull" (ἐκ δωρεᾶς βασιλικῆς διὰ χρυσοβούλλου), and also of one of the *paroikoi* who was situated there,[4] for the salvation of the emperor's soul, their father's and their own.[5]

The deception of the state by a private individual is revealed in an order (ὁρισμός) given by Andronikos II to the *domestikos ton dytikon thematon*, Georgios Strategos, and to kyr Nicholas Theologitis, in August 1312.[6] An accusation was made by the monks of the monastery of St. John Prodromos on Mt. Menoikeion, who presented to the emperor documents (a chrysobull and *apographikai apokatastaseis)* proving that long ago they had been granted land but had had trouble with Georgios Troulinos, who was obviously their neighbour and an *oikeios* of the emperor. Prior troubles caused by him had forced the oppressed (δυναστευόμενοι) monks to seek a judgement,[7] which by order of Empress Anna was granted to the monastery. Troulinos was obliged to promise in writing that he would not challenge the outcome and that from then on he would abstain from making any claims on the land (θά ἀπέχῃ τέλεον τῆς τοιαύτης γῆς).[8] For some time (about 30 years[9]) the monks had possession of their land undisturbed. However Troulinos, when the opportunity arose of preparing a *praktikon* for his *oikonomia*, "by cheating and deceiving us" (δολιευσάμενος καὶ ἀπατήσας

1. A controversial figure, characterized by features in common with Anemas (ibid. 329), whose mention (once, line 8) finally enhances the confusion about the case.
2. Ibid. line 109.
3. *Chil.* no. 6 ('Αφιερώσεως ἔγγραφον).
4. Ibid. lines 2–4, 28–30 and 33–4.
5. Ibid. lines 31–3.
6. *Prodrome* no. 5.
7. ... ἀντεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ ... (ibid. line 8).
8. Ibid. lines 11–12.
9. Since the *horismos* of Anna of Hungary, consort of Andronikos II, and therefore the judgement precede 1282, the year of the death of the empress (cf. *Prodrome* p. 47).

ἡμᾶς),[1] as the emperor himself confesses, managed to have the disputed land included in the lands granted to him by the state. Having grabbed this opportunity he extended his sway over the rest of the land and held it for himself (δραξάμενος ἀφορμῆς ἥπλωσε καὶ κατεκράτησε ταύτην) by expelling the monks.[2] "What right did he have to act like that", wondered the emperor and concluded that his *oikeios* had done something utterly wrong and unreasonable (παντελῶς ἄδικον καὶ παράλογον).[3] The final judgement made by Andronikos is similar. His officials ought to have ensured immediately that the monastery would possess the disputed land, without obstruction and tyrannising (χωρὶς ἐμποδισμὸν καὶ καταδυναστείαν) on the part of Troulinos, and have the *praktikon* of the latter corrected on that point. From what we know, the monastery acquired the land once again[4] and Troulinos' ambitions were probably checked.

A similar dispute, which lasted for at least a decade, appears in another four documents which concern the same monastery. Three of these, the chrysobull (χρυσόβουλλος λόγος) of September 1317[5] and two orders (προστάγματα) of April and November 1325,[6] are signed by Andronikos II. The emperor, having ratified the various monastery possessions in 1317, accepts the request of his daughter Simonis, the *Kralaina* of the Serbs, and in addition grants to the monastery an *agridion*, the *Monospeton*.[7] The problem with this particular piece of land was that it was already held by a soldier called Nikephoros Martinos as part of his *oikonomia*, as is stated in great detail in the first order of 1325.[8] This document is dismissed by Andronikos for the reason that, even though he had given an order at the end of 1317, or shortly thereafter, for compensation of an equal amount (ἴσην ποσότητα) to be granted for the removal of the *agridion*, Sevastos Martinos[9] chose to take advantage of the confused state of affairs — that is, the civil war between the two Andronikoi — and thus keep the *Monospeton*.[10] The emperor, now respecting his original decision[11] to grant the piece of land to the monastery, stresses once again that Martinos would not suffer any ill-treatment and specifies the *oikonomia* from which an equal amount would be granted in place of that taken away from

1. Ibid. lines 13–14.
2. Ibid. lines 15–16.
3. Ibid. lines 19 and 21–2.
4. See *Prodrome* p. 47.
5. *Prodrome* no. 7.
6. *Prodrome* nos. 16 and 17.
7. *Prodrome* no. 7.15–18.
8. *Prodrome* no. 16.8–10 (... ὅπερ ἐκράτει διὰ πρακτικοῦ εἰς τὴν ποσότητα τῆς οἰκονομίας αὐτοῦ...)
9. Ibid. lines 11–15 and pp. 68–9.
10. Ibid. lines 15–17. Cf. p. 68, on the way in which this was accomplished. Martinos was loyal to Andronikos II, while at the same period the founder and protector of the Prodromos monastery, the bishop of Zichnai, supported Andronikos III.
11. ... διὰ τὴν τιμὴν προηγουμένως καὶ τὸ ἀκατάλυτον τοῦ δηλωθέντος χρυσοβούλλου ... (ibid. no. 16.25).

Martinos' *oikonomia*.[1] It appears, however, that Martinos was once again not convinced,[2] and so a few months later the emperor intervened and, having outlined the entire story to the *domestikos* John Tarchaneiotes, gave clear and irreversible instructions for the immediate handing over of the piece of land to the monastery, concluding in an austere and angry manner: "Either this Martinos wants and wishes that in place of this he shall accept the said amount, ... that's good; if not ... he is going to be deprived of it." A significant threat, if one takes into account that it was not unusual to impose upon the owner of an *oikonomia* certain changes in his source of income. It is rather improbable, however, that the fixed amount of his annual income would have been reduced without reason. Besides, Andronikos in his previous letter had promised a full and equal amount (ἀκεραίαν καὶ ἀνυστέρητον ποσότητα)[3] for Martinos. In the last of our documents, which is an order (ὁρισμός) issued in August 1327,[4] Andronikos III informs the *protovestiaritis* Andronikos Kantakouzenos about this still unresolved matter, stressing that Martinos, having received and concealed (λαθὼν καὶ ἀποκρύψας) the emperor's wish, had continued to retain the piece of land.[5] He orders, in a mild but decisive manner, to have the matter resolved in favour of the monastery, which in future should not be *tyrannised or troubled* by anyone, especially Martinos,[6] who would pay the consequences of his actions by being forced to accept some abandoned property (ἐξαλειμματικὰ κτήματα) as compensation.[7]

Ratification of the return of land which had been previously "taken away" was sought by the monks of the monastery Docheiariou on Mt. Athos, and obtained in May 1343 through a chrysobull given by John V Palaiologos.[8] This concerns land of fifteen hundred *modioi* which was granted to the *Barbarini* (Berber) soldiers and a lay owner of an *oikonomia* named Neokastritis, and also of other land of three hundred and fifty *modioi* which was given to Komnenoutzikos and then to the *vestiarios* kyr Manuel *kata logon gonikotetos*.[9] This last arrangement turned out to be in favour of the monks, who through the mediation of the *oikeios* kyr Manuel re-acquired the land of three hundred and fifty *modioi* in 1337 with the right of

---

1. It was the οἰκονομία of a deceased Sarakinos (ibid. lines 28–32). The ποσότης of the piece of farmland under claim is mentioned in the four documents sometimes as 24 and sometimes as 30 ὑπέρπυρα. The matter lies unresolved (cf. *Prodrome* p. 81 n. 3) and I mention it elsewhere, where I deal with some documents also referred to here, naturally by examining them from a different viewpoint: T. Maniati-Kokkini, *Ὁ βυζαντινός θεσμός τῆς "πρόνοιας"* (typescript Thessaloniki 1990, in press).
2. *Prodrome* no. 17.15–16.
3. *Prodrome* no. 16.32–3.
4. *Prodrome* no. 22.
5. Ibid. lines 13–16.
6. Ibid. lines 22–5.
7. Ibid. lines 25–6: ... δοθῇ ἀπὸ ἐξαλειμματικῶν καὶ ἐλευθέρων τινῶν ἰσότοπον; cf. ἰσόποσον in the other documents of the *dossier*.
8. *Docheiar.* no. 21.
9. Ibid. lines 4–12. Cf. also pp. 140–1.

possession *kata logon gonikotetos* even after the death of Manuel.[1] Another document, dated September 1344 and bearing the signature of the *protovestiaritis* John Doukas,[2] ratifies once again the monastery's possession of the first piece of land, for in the meantime the monastery's rights to that land had been challenged. In particular an *apographeus* by the name of Hageris, whilst conducting a census in the area, "took away" the land from the monastery[3] on the grounds that it had previously been granted to the *Barbarini* and Neokastritis. From the beginning the *hegoumenos* raised objections to this wrongful act and succeeded in getting a "cross examination" with the *apographeus*[4] in which he admitted that "this land had previously been taken away by *apographeis*." Nevertheless, he claimed that this had not been done "rightly but wrongly and unreasonably", and for that reason the emperor (Andronikos III) had ordered that the property be returned to the monastery.[5] In the end, when the process had reached a stalemate, the fact that the monastery had had possession (νομή) of the land for three hundred years was taken into account, and was considered to be the strongest proof.[6] So by the monastery's account justice was done.

An imperial order to which the *megas dioiketes* John Doukas Balsamon responds in 1355,[7] and which could have been issued as a result of a reminder, if not a persistent request, by the monastery Docheiariou, grants to the monastery a village and "land of one thousand *modioi*" which had earlier belonged to it through an imperial grant. The monastery had lost all rights to the village when it was "taken away" and handed over to Michael Pitzikopoulos, one of the *dytikoi archontopouloi*, who was no longer alive; he in turn had ceased to possess the land when the state appointed a new beneficiary, Theodore Mouzalon, an officer from the Great Allagion of Thessaloniki (ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεσσαλονικαίου μεγάλου ἀλλαγίου). The second of these properties had already been given back to the monastery by order (πρόσταγμα) of the Empress Anna of Savoy[8] following the assassination of Mouzalon by the Turks.

Unique for its contents is a document of 1393, a decision (κρισιμόγραφον) of an ecclesiastical court made by Matthaios, the metropolitan of Serres, regarding the possession of half a village.[9] Four monasteries of Mt. Athos and Thessaloniki

---

1. See *Docheiar.* no. 18 (Σιγιλλιῶδες γράμμα τοῦ δομεστίκου τῶν θεμάτων of May 1337 by Konstantinos Makrinos) and mainly lines 16–17, 19–20 and 25–8.
2. *Docheiar.* no. 23.
3. ... Ἔφθασεν ... ἀποτεμὼν καὶ δημοσιεύσας γῆν ἀπὸ τοῦ ... κτήματος (ibid. lines 1–2 and 5–6). The document refers to Manuel Hageris, *apographeus* and *orphanotrophos*; cf. PLP no. 30344.
4. Ibid. line 4 (... ἀντικριθῇ ...).
5. Ibid. lines 29–31.
6. ... νομὴν τριακοσίων χρόνων, ἧς οὐδὲν ἰσχυρότερον ... (ibid. line 40). Cf. *"Περὶ νομῆς καὶ δεσποτείας", Ἀρμενοπούλου Πρόχειρον Νόμων ἢ Ἑξάβιβλος* ed. K.G. Pitsakis (Athens 1971) 98–107.
7. *Docheiar.* no. 29.
8. Ibid. lines 8–9 and p. 192; cf. also p. 209.
9. *Esphig.* no. 30.

became involved in this matter, as owners and not just as possessors of the land, as well as a lay person named Demetrios Laskaris, who temporarily held the remaining half of the village under *pronoia*. Relying on this circumstance, Laskaris bought the other half from the monastery of Akapniou, making use of his right as owner of adjacent land (ἀνακοίνωσις) to offer service to the monastery of Koutloumousiou, which had provided the purchase money as it was not eligible to plead the right of a further adjacency (πλησιασμός).[1] Soon afterwards he donated that part of the village to the monastery of Koutloumousiou. The monks of Chilandari, however, challenged the sale as unlawful on the grounds that Laskaris was only the holder and not the owner of one section of the village. He had therefore improperly claimed the right of πλησιασμός so as to be the preferred buyer, whereas they themselves had this right on the property sold. An investigation of the matter demonstrated that the monastery of Koutloumousiou as well as Laskaris himself had acted deceitfully,[2] something which the latter agreed to in writing. In the meantime, the Esphigmenite monks also became involved, invoking rights of ἀνακοίνωσις. An on-the-spot investigation showed that they were indeed the closest neighbours and they eventually won the case, having also the consent of Laskaris himself.

The "co-existence" of lay and church possessors of state properties, not in the form of adjacency but of "co-possession", is mentioned in the *praktikon* of *paradosis* of lands belonging to the monastery Docheiariou signed by Pavlos Gazis and Georgios Prinkips in May 1409.After the usual counting of the *paroikoi* of four villages — included of course in the *oikonomia* of the monastery — and the recording of their properties and the corresponding taxes, it is made clear that the *paroikoi* should pay the total amount of the tax owed to the occasional *pronoiarioi*, while towards the "very honourable monks" (τιμιώτατοι μοναχοί) they ought to exhibit "proper respect and obedience", doing for them the usual *angareiai*, paying some secondary taxes and "anything else that they usually have the right to receive from such villages."[3]

From the documents we have presented so far and from many others of a similar content we note:

I. The obvious disposition of the Byzantine state, as was noted in the beginning, to lavish grants on church institutions and on lay representatives of the middle and upper class, temporarily denying itself some of its rights, mainly taxes. Even though there are many extant documents from Macedonia, the fact that they have been kept mainly in monastic archives does not of course allow us to produce statistical findings as to the quantitative or qualitative superiority or inferiority of such concessions granted to the laity vis-à-vis those that were granted to the Church. Only hypotheses can be made, and such hypotheses are more likely when based on historical data or the known tendency of the emperors to limit the power

1. On these two terms see infra n. 64.
2. ... καὶ τοῦ κατὰ τὴν πρᾶσίν τε καὶ ἀφιέρωσιν δόλου ἀπελεγχθέντος (*Esphig.* no. 30.21).
3. *Docheiar.* no. 53 lines 19–24.

of the aristocracy and the excessive enrichment of the monasteries. Certainly, state concessions granted to both sides were significant in numbers and economic value.[1]

II. The obvious and predictable contrast between lay and church holders of land and privileges in Macedonia as they came into frequent contact either as neighbours or as successive holders of the same land. The fact that we refer to church and lay holders of land and privileges does not mean that they can always be contrasted as separate entities. Disputes usually occur at the level of individual cases of landowners who may be either monasteries or *dynatoi* laymen. However, we are forced to see them as members of either side and not as particular individuals. What I mean will become clear if we attempt to create a picture of the relationship of church and lay holders of *oikonomiai* and privileges within Macedonia, as well as of the repercussions of the state interventions and arrangements which were made from time to time. I consider this proposal to be of greater interest and more feasible than the comparison of the rights that were granted by the emperor each time. With this in mind, the documents selected for presentation and examination are those in which both sides appear repeatedly, and usually have some dispute to settle. This picture is easier to draw if we pay special attention to some of the terms which appear frequently in the Byzantine documents[2] and attempt to distinguish their true meaning and implications. Thus:

1. The most common relationship which exists amongst privileged holders of state land is that of adjacency.[3] Monasteries and laymen, whether state officials or soldiers (especially those who are holders of *oikonomiai* of lesser value) collect the fixed amount of their entitlement from *paroikoi* who often cultivate adjacent properties and who, though related to each other, pay to various beneficiaries the money owing to the state in the form of a πάκτον, μορτή or τέλος. In the areas of Thessaloniki and Chalkidike in particular, those privileged appear literally to "crowd themselves" over an area that is not large but profitable and accessible, and for this reason obviously much sought after. They are the holders of "properties manorial, personal, ecclesiastical, monastic, military, granted by chrysobull, and so on" (κτήματα ἀρχοντικά, προσωπικά, ἐκκλησιαστικά, μοναστηριακά, στρατιωτικά, χρυσοβουλλάτα καὶ λοιπά)[4] who, from time to time, upon the emperor's order, are subjected to an *apographe*, after which they obtain a new *praktikon* ratifying their *oikonomia*.

---

1. Cf. G. Ostrogorsky, "Observations on the Aristocracy in Byzantium" *DOP* 25 (1971) 19.
2. This is why references to the following documents are only to select examples out of many identical or similar reports.
3. See infra n. 64.
4. A common expression at the beginning of many extant *praktika apographikes exisoseos*. See among others *Zogr.* no. 17.3–5 of the year 1320. A similar expression is found in documents of the same type from 1321: ... τῶν κτημάτων τῶν ἀρχόντων τῶν προσγενῶν τοῦ ... βασιλέως καὶ τῶν ἑτέρων ἀρχόντων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν, μοναστηριακῶν, στρατιωτικῶν, χρυσοβουλλάτων καὶ λοιπῶν ... (see *Xénoph.* no. 15.2–3 of the year 1321).

The state audit, the *apographike exisosis kai apokatastasis*,[1] often reveals breaches and arbitrary increases of the amount of an *oikonomia*, actions which are not only harmful to the state but also affect the neighbours. Of course, these discrepancies are corrected by the relevant *apographeis*.[2] State officials, however, are called upon even outside censorial periods, on the initiative of those affected, in order to examine the degree to which the holder of an *oikonomia* has breached the rights of his neighbour. The documents refer to ambiguities (ἀμφιβολία) surrounding the possession of land or of *paroikoi*,[3] and to the ensuing hearing (κρίσις or ἀντίκρισις),[4] during which the documents of the original granting and *paradosis* following a censorial audit are examined as evidence and proof of legal possession. These challenges often reveal fraud on the part of one of the parties involved, who sometimes tries to deceive even the state authorities so that the land and the *paroikoi* he wishes to hold are included in his *praktikon*, thus providing him with the necessary documentary evidence.[5] In the document of 1393, where an abuse of the right of *protimesis* based on πλησιασμός is described, we see an attempt to deceive the state and an abuse of privileges provided by the law to the neighbours as owners and not holders of land.[6]

At other times the holders of *oikonomiai*, without actually officially breaching the rights of their neighbours, resort to causing troubles (διενόχλησις, καταδυναστεία καὶ ἐπίθεσις)[7] with a view to regaining the holding and benefits (νομὴ καὶ κατοχή) of land to which they, rightly or wrongly, lay a claim. When they fail and the judgement of competent imperial representatives calls them to order, they are obligated to provide a written[8] or verbal promise that they will not repeat the trouble as expressly stated in the document resolving that dispute. Quite often, however, the troublesome neighbour does not give up so easily,[9] and the state

---

1. ... ὡρίσθημεν ποιῆσαι ἀπογραφικὴν ἐξίσωσιν καὶ ἀποκατάστασιν ...; see *Zogr.* no. 17.2 and *Xénoph.* no. 15.1.
2. Cf. the actions of *apographeus* Hageris when he considered that the monastery Docheiariou was holding a piece of land illegally (see supra *Docheiar.* no. 23).
3. See *Lavra* I no. 64.26 and the whole document in general which was analysed above.
4. See the cases of the monastery of St. John Prodromos on Menoikeion regarding Georgios Troulinos (*Prodrome* nos. 5.8 and 11) and of the Docheiariou monastery regarding the *apographeus* Hageris (*Docheiar.* no. 23.4 and 11ff).
5. *Prodrome* no. 5.13–14.
6. Cf. E. Papayianni, "Ο όρος 'ανακοίνωση' στο εμπράγματο δίκαιο της βυζαντινής περιόδου" *Byzantiaka* 10 (1990) 226; H. Saradi, "The Neighbors' Pre-emption Right. Notes on the Byzantine Documents of Transactions" *Diptycha* 6 (1994–5) 272–3.
7. Ibid. no. 22.24–5. See also *Chil.* no. 95.4–10 (Πρόσταγμα of Andronikos II Palaiologos, 1323): ... οἱ μοναχοὶ Χελανταρίου ἀνέφερον ὅτι εἰς τὸ κατεχόμενον διὰ χρυσοβούλλου ... χωρίον τὰ Κριτζιανὰ ὑφίστανται διενόχλησιν ἀπὸ τινος τῶν ἐποίκων τῆς ... Θεσσαλονίκης, τοῦ Σαραντηνοῦ ...
8. See *Prodrome* no. 5.10–12; *Lavra* I no. 64.109.
9. Cf. the case of Pangratios Anemas (*Lavra* I no. 64) vis-à-vis that of Demetrios Laskaris who immediately withdraws when the illegality of his demands is revealed (*Esphig.* no. 30).

authorities intervene again once the party in whose favour the first judgement was made complains to the emperor himself.[1]

Regarding the question of the conduct of neighbour-holders[2] of *oikonomiai*, I have deliberately excluded reference to the identity of a fraudulent and troublesome neighbour as either a representative of the laity or of the Church. I did this since usually those who appear to be in the wrong in these documents are indeed the laity; but again I do not, as was previously stressed, think that any valid conclusions can be drawn on this matter, for we study mainly documents which have been kept in monastic archives and are therefore valuable to the monastery because they concern land that was finally returned to it. At any rate monasteries, whether they had had bad experiences with their neighbours or were simply afraid of possible claims by their neighbours, made certain that they were protected from them by keeping a record of imperial documents ratifying their possessions "... to ward off with the sight of this my royal chrysobull any and every person who might attempt in uncontrolled greed to trample these rights under foot and upset the monks" (...ἀποσοβεῖσθαι τῇ ἐμφανείᾳ τοῦ παρόντος χρυσοβούλλου τῆς βασιλείας μου ἅπαντα τὸν πειραθησόμενον πλεονεκτικῶς καὶ παραλόγως πόδα παραβαλεῖν ἐπὶ τούτοις [sc. τοῖς δικαίοις] καὶ ταραχήν προξενῆσαι τοῖς μοναχοῖς...)[3]

2. Even more complicated is the relationship between successive holders of either a whole *oikonomia*, or, as is often the case, part of one. The inventory of land belonging to an *oikonomia* frequently mentions the "prior holders,"[4] as they are referred to. We should first of all distinguish here the Church and the laity as two sides with conflicting interests, since the successive transfer of land to different monasteries is infrequent, while the successive transfer of land to different lay persons, mainly *pronoiarioi*, is very common. This was often due to death or, less frequently, to the displeasure of the emperor with a citizen. Such matters, however, are not relevant to the topic under discussion.

Our sources also refer to sequestrations (ἀποσπάσεις) when lands which had previously been granted to a monastery by an imperial order, are later — following a new imperial order — granted to another owner, this time a member of the laity. The

---

1. Cf. the case of Georgios Troulinos (*Prodrome* no. 5).
2. Neighbours in a broad sense, because we do not always know the degree of adjacency of the lands of the opposing parties (apart from the cases such as the two *Archontochoria*, in *Lavra* I no. 64). At any rate, conflicts between the two sides are indicative of the existence of interests in neighbouring lands. Cf. the meaning of the term πλησιασμός, i.e. a relationship more or less adjacent, as related to the term ἀνακοίνωσις, which means common boundaries (see relevant remarks in *Esphig.* p. 174; and cf. Papayianni, "Ο όρος 'ανακοίνωση'" 224).
3. *Docheiar.* no. 8.22–4 (Χρυσόβουλλον σιγίλλιον of Michael VIII Palaiologos of January 1267 or 1282).
4. Cf. ... τῷ ζευγηλατείῳ τῇ Γορεαντζῇ, καθὼς προκατείχετο τοῦτο παρὰ τοῦ πανσεβάστου σεβαστοῦ οἰκείου τῇ βασιλείᾳ μου λογαριαστοῦ τῆς αὐλῆς τοῦ Κασανδρηνοῦ ... (*Chil.* no. 42.9–11, Χρυσόβουλλος λόγος of Michael IX Palaiologos of March 1319).

monastery thereafter seeks to regain the land or privileges which were "taken away" and this is perhaps the reason why it takes the matter to the emperor, sometimes aided by strong supporters.[1] It usually succeeds in regaining possession of the land, even after a long period when the lay holder has died and the land has been transferred to the state[2] or is in the possession of a successor of the first holder in whose favour it was "taken away" from the monastery.[3] But, of course, even these cases require that a judgement or a decision be made by officials of the state. The decision relies on the following (stated in order of importance):[4] (a) the possession of the written privileges (ἔγγραφα δικαιώματα)[5] of each side, that is the documents, especially the oldest ones,[6] which could prove the granting and possession of the land, and mainly *praktika paradoseos* or *apographikes paradoseos*, which describe in detail an *oikonomia*, since the imperial documents (*horismoi* or chrysobulls) refer to it in general terms; (b) if the matter involves the possession of land and the relevant documents have been lost or destroyed "by the anomalies of the times"[7] (that is in one of the many raids and occupations that the land of Macedonia was subjected to during that time), the testimony of older people in the area who probably knew the status of the territory; (c) the συνορισμός, that is knowledge of the boundaries of the disputed land and conveying this information to the mediators of the dispute; (d) ἐπιστασία, that is an on-the-spot investigation of claims relating to the rights of possession of a piece of land,[8] and finally, in case both sides produced equally significant evidence, the length of time the disputed land was in possession (νομή) of each of the parties involved. As is characteristically stated: Ἐν οἷς ἡ αἰτία ἴση κρείσσων ἐστὶν ὁ νεμόμενος ("When other claims are equal, the possessor prevails").[9] That monasteries would win a dispute even in these cases may be interpreted in two ways: either the monasteries were indeed right and their lay opponents did not have in their possession any documents at all indicating their rights, or the monasteries were better able to preserve the documents handed over to them by the imperial authorities.

---

1. Cf. Manuel *vestiarios*, *oikeios* of the emperor, in the case of returning a piece of land to the monastery Docheiariou in 1337 (*Docheiar.* no. 18); see also infra n. 77.
2. See *Docheiar.* no. 29 of 1355, which was presented above.
3. See *Docheiar.* no. 41 of 1373, according to which Ioannis Katzaras, a relative of the *despotes* Manuel Palaiologos and son of the *megas adnoumiastes* Katzaras, after judging the case, loses his rights on land of 2400 *modioi* that had been granted to his father with a right of transferring it to his son.
4. Ibid. lines 28–39, where a similar procedure is analysed. Cf. D. Simon, Η εύρεση του δικαίου στο ανώτατο Βυζαντινό δικαστήριο (Athens 1982).
5. See *Docheiar.* no. 23.14 and 45 (and passim).
6. See *Docheiar.* no. 23.25, where the *apographeus* Hageris τούτοις, τοσούτοις καὶ τοιούτοις οὖσι τοῖς δικαιώμασι (i.e. of the monastery Docheiariou), μὴ ἀρκούμενος ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ τούτων ἔτι ζητῶν ἰδεῖν ἀρχαιότερα ...
7. Cf. *Docheiar.* no. 41.33; see supra n. 43.
8. See also the decision of the ecclesiastical court in the case of Demetrios Laskaris and the four monasteries: ... ἐπιστασίαν τοπικὴν γενέσθαι ... (*Esphig.* no.30.41).
9. ... διὰ τὸν κανόνα τὸν λέγοντα ... (*Docheiar.* no. 23.46).

In the mid-fourteenth century monks, especially those of Mt. Athos, took advantage of the interruption of Byzantine rule over the greater part of Macedonia and the beneficial policy of the Serbian ruler Stefan Dušan by re-acquiring many of the lands that previously "had been taken away" (ἀποσπασθέντας τόπους).[1]

The "taking away" of land is also repeatedly mentioned in the case of lay owners of *oikonomiai*, the clear intention on the part of the state being to grant them to a monastery. The intervention of important persons in favour of the monasteries in these cases also is understandable and desirable for the monks.[2] Many times, however, the lay holders of land attempt to delay or cancel the implementation of the imperial order, taking advantage of the domestic problems of the empire (τὴν εἰς τὰ πράγματα σύγχυσιν).[3]

It is clear that any change in possession of the land usually takes place as the result of an imperial decision; in essence, however, it is usually preceded by a request, if not a claim, from the party concerned, who is certainly more powerful than the one who already possesses the land. It is also certain that the former holder, if there are no grounds on which he could lose all of his *oikonomia*,[4] is usually compensated by a piece of land of equal value (ἰσόποσον).[5] It appears, however, that the new property, though it would bring the same financial benefit (ποσόν) to its possessor, was not considered by him to be equal to the one he previously possessed, and this must explain his unwillingness to comply with the imperial order. At any rate, these holders would never wish to refuse openly to comply with the order, since the state had the absolute right to take the land away from them; no

---

1. See most of Dušan's documents concerning the monasteries. Cf. my paper "Προνομιακές παραχωρήσεις τοῦ Σέρβου αὐτοκράτορα Στεφάνου Dušan (1344–1355)" in *Byzantium and Serbia in the 14th Century. International Symposium 3* (Athens 1996) 299ъ329. See also infra n. 84. Cf. however, the somewhat exaggerated contents of a letter of Ioannis Palaiologos about the financial situation of the monastery Megiste Lavra: ... κατήντησε ... καὶ εὑρίσκεται νῦν ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν πραγμάτων ἀνωμαλίας τε καὶ συγχύσεως εἰς ἐσχάτην ταλαιπωρίαν καὶ ἔνδειαν, τῶν κτημάτων αὐτοῦ φθαρέντων καὶ ἀναλωθέντων ἀπό τε τῆς πολλῆς τῶν Σέρβων ἐπιθέσεως ἀπό τε τῆς λεηλασίας καὶ τῶν κούρσων τῶν ἀθέων ἐχθρῶν ... (*Lavra* III app. XV, post August 1370 – ante 1391, and p. 214).
2. Cf. the mediation of the daughter of the Byzantine emperor and consort of the Serbian ruler Simonis in favour of the Prodromos monastery (case of Nikephoros Martinos, *Prodrome* nos. 7, 16, 17 and 22).
3. See the case of Nikephoros Martinos (*Prodrome* no. 16.15–17).
4. This would be justified mainly in times of civil conflict when *oikonomiai* were taken away from supporters of the pretenders to the throne; see e.g. the confiscations of properties held by *dynatoi* supporting Ioannis Kantakouzenos or Ioannis Palaiologos in V. Kravari, "Nouveaux documents du monastère de Philothée" *TM* 10 (1987) 294.
5. See, apart from the case of Nikephoros Martinos, *Lavra* II no. 97.5–7 (Παραδοτικόν γράμμα of April 1304 by Theodoros Tzimbeas): ... παραδώσεις πρὸς τὸ μέρος τῆς ... μεγάλης Λαύρας ... διὰ τε παροίκων καὶ γῆς ποσότητα ὑπερπύρων διακοσίων ἑξήκοντα ... πρὸς δὲ τοὺς στρατιώτας ἐξ ὧν μέλλεις ἀποσπᾶσαι τὴν τοιαύτην ποσότητα παραδώσεις ὁμοίως ἀλλαχόθεν ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας σου ἑτέραν ἴσην ποσότητα, καὶ οὐδὲν στερηθῶσιν οἱ τοιοῦτοι τοῦ τυχόντος ἐξ αὐτῶν.

permanent title on land was ever granted, but only the right to hold and benefit from it.

This was the situation prior to 1371. Then, following the defeat of the Serbs, the Byzantine emperor was forced to begin taking away half of the lands granted to the monasteries of Mt. Athos and Thessaloniki and giving them to lay people in order to strengthen the defensive forces of Byzantium against the Turks.[1] The monks raised strong objections to this "confiscation," as they called it, and to the "pronoiarisation" (that is the granting of the land that was taken away from them as *pronoia*), [2] a move that significantly affected their financial condition. So they immediately started the "battle" to regain the rights they had lost, which in essence was the abolition of tax deductions only for that part of their land which was taken away.[3] The sources mention the *apographike paradosis* to a monastery of an entire or one half of a village, with or without any explanation as to the remaining part of it.[4] In 1408, the emperor Manuel II, visiting Thessaloniki, stated to the monks of Mt. Athos, who were always complaining, that he could not yet return the land that had been taken away but promised tax concessions instead.[5] Eventually the monks succeeded in getting many exchanges (ἀνταλλαγαί) with the state so that they again became the possessors of an entire village, of which after 1371 they had held only half, in exchange for a renunciation of their rights to the half of another village. As to the reason why the monks sought these exchanges we should consider not so much their preference for certain villages but the fact that they did not like the idea of being neighbours with the state and especially the lay people to whom the land that was taken away would be given. In the beginning of the fifteenth century, they openly complain of the attacks, actions and troubles they are subjected to in their own share of the land (διὰ τὰς ἐπιθέσεις, ἐπηρείας καὶ ὀχλήσεις ἅς εὑρίσκουσιν ἐν τοῖς αὐτῶν μετοχίοις), and consider this as a ground for an exchange.[6] Nevertheless, as such ἀνταλλαγαί did not occur in all areas, clergy

1. See infra a later mention of this subject in a Πρόσταγμα of Manuel II Palaiologos of December 1408 in V. Mošin, "Akti ... " *Spomenik Srpska kraljevska Akademija* 91 (1939) 165.3–9: ... διὰ τὴν ἐπίθεσιν τὴν τότε γεγονυίαν παρὰ τῶν Τούρκων ... ἔδοξεν, ἵνα προνοιασθῶσι τὰ ἡμίση τῶν μετοχίων τῶν τε Ἁγιορειτῶν καὶ τῶν Θεσσαλονικέων, καὶ ἁπλῶς πάντα, διὰ τὸ μήποτε ἅπαντα συλλήβδην χαθῶσιν ...
2. On the case in general see *Lavra* IV 52–3 (by P. Lemerle).
3. Cf. the rights of monks and *pronoiarioi* in *Docheiar.* no. 53 of 1409 and p. 129.
4. See *Docheiar.* no. 53.2–3: ... τὸ ὅλον τοῦ πύργου τῆς Περιγαρδικείας, τὸ ἥμισυ τοῦ πύργου αὐτῶν (*i.e.* of the monks) τῆς Ἑρμηλείας, τὸ ὅλον τοῦ χωρίου τῶν Μαριανῶν καὶ τὸ ἥμισυ τοῦ Καλοκάμπου ..., and cf. an older document of 1347 returning lands, by Stefan Dušan (*Lavra* III no. 128.27–9): ... εἰς τὸ εἰς τὰ Σιδηροκαυσεῖα καταφύγιον προκατεῖχεν μὲν ἡ τοιαύτη Λαύρα τὸ ἥμισυ διὰ παλαιγενῶν χρυσοβούλλων, εὐεργετεῖ ἡ βασιλεία μου ἰδίως καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν ἅπαν ὅσον εὑρίσκεται δημοσιακὸν καὶ προνοιαστικόν.
5. See V. Mošin, "Akti ... " (n. 81 supra) 165–7.
6. *Lavra* III no. 162.2–3 ('Ορισμός of April 1409 by the *despotes* of Thessaloniki Andronikos Palaiologos). Cf. also the obviously slightly older document no. 161.4–5

and laity were forced on a number of occasions to be not only neighbours but also co-possessors of the same land.[1]

At any rate, whether these halves which were taken away from the monasteries were returned or not, we must admit that even though the state was forced to resort to a measure which indeed affected rights that had been granted to the monasteries, it tried from the beginning to lessen as much as it could the consequences of this move. This, I think, is what is indicated by the "taking away" of only half of the pieces of their land. In this way monasteries kept their hopes alive that in the future they might regain that land, regardless of whether in the end — for the reasons that we have mentioned — they opted for "exchanges".

3. Despite tensions in their relationships as neighbours, and the justified animosity felt by one side because of the removal of their land for the benefit of the other side, the laity and the church holders of *oikonomiai* in Macedonia maintained good relations. The monks prayed for the salvation of the souls of the laity who, in turn, showed their respect by looking after the monasteries and by helping them maintain their good financial situation. The lay holders of an *oikonomia* did not restrict themselves to aiding the monasteries in the hope that the emperor might grant them a piece of land,[2] nor did they simply donate land which was owned by their ancestors. Such actions on their part do not concern us and they are no different to those of other contemporary wealthy and respected citizens. The important thing is that they found a way to donate to the monasteries part of their *oikonomia* or *pronoia* which, being state land, was only temporarily granted for possession (κατοχὴ καὶ νομὴ). But we have insufficient data which comes mostly from the fourteenth century[3] when conditions generally became more difficult,[4] whilst at the same time many holders had acquired the right to transfer their *oikonomia* to their children.[5] The lands donated were usually abandoned (ἐξαλείμματα)[6] and therefore problematic from the point of view of cultivation at times when hands were short. These lay holders usually stress that they donate the lands for the period that they themselves also have rights on them.[7] This is why, in return, they ask the

---

('Ανταλλακτήριον γράμμα of April 1409) which is ratified by the document no. 162 (ibid. 161).

1. See *Docheiar.* no. 53 of 1409.
2. Cf. the mediation for the return to a monastery of a piece of land that had been "taken away" (see supra n. 77 and also n. 67).
3. See *Docheiar.* nos. 13, 14 ('Αφιερωτήρια ἔγγραφα of 1313 and 1314).
4. See N. Oikonomides, "Το μερίδιο των μοναστηρίων στην αγορά της Τουρκοκρατούμενης Θεσσαλονίκης (1400)" *Χριστιανική Θεσσαλονίκη. Ζ΄ Επιστημονικό Συμπόσιο· Σταυροπηγιακές και Ενοριακές Μονές* (Thessaloniki 1995) 79.
5. A similar remark, that old *pronoiai* became lands of the Church after they were transformed into "full ownerships" (I would describe them as possessions transferable to one more generation) is supported by N. Svoronos, "Petite et grande exploitation à Byzance" *Annales ESC* 11 (1956) 325–35, rp. Svoronos, *Études* II 329.
6. *Docheiar.* nos. 13.4 and 14.3–4.
7. ... μέχρις ἄν δηλαδὴ παρ' ἐμοῦ καί τῶν παίδων μου ἡ πρόνοια κατέχηται ... (*Docheiar.* no. 13. 6–7 and cf. no. 14.6). Cf. also the following reference.

monks first to commemorate the emperor's name and then their own,[1] accepting thus that they are only holders and not owners of these lands. However, neither time limitations nor qualitative "impediments" prevented monasteries from accepting those donations with joy,[2] which in the end may not be perhaps so few as the extant documents suggest. The reason that they not only accepted but probably sought such donations was not, I think, to satisfy the temporary needs of the monasteries, which perhaps were not in good financial shape at a time of wide-spread difficulties, but rather "to register a future mortgage" in the hope that these lands would in time be incorporated into their *oikonomia*. And it appears that the hope of the monks was not unreasonable judging from the emperor's ratification of such donations, even in the mid-thirteenth and fourteenth centuries,[3] and also by a "strange" return of a piece of land in the mid-fourteenth century, by the intervention of the important person to whom it had been granted, something which in fact was a donation.[4]

We may consider that the testimonies relating to the lease of properties to a monastery at the beginning of the fourteenth century also refer to a donation from which further economic benefits would ensue in exchange for prayers. These properties were abandoned (ἐξαλειμματικά) and had once belonged to the *oikonomia* of a lay person. In this form two Athonite monasteries came into conflict over its acquisition.[5]

Another unique case of a "donation" is that which occurred in the late fourteenth century when, as we have seen, the donation did not belong to an *oikonomia*, but the donor was the possessor of a *pronoia* who breached the law in order to help a monastery obtain the land it wanted: "he pretended to own the land, allegedly to donate it to them in exchange for gifts of a spiritual kind" (περιποιήσασθαι τὴν τούτου δεσποτείαν αὐτοῖς ἀφιερώσεως δῆθεν τρόπῳ καὶ ψυχικῆς ἕνεκεν δωρεᾶς).[6]

---

1. Cf. *Docheiar.* p. 127. In the document of the donation of the three brothers (*Chil.* no. 6 of 1265) which was mentioned above, the donors do not make any reference to time limitations, but they too ask for a commemoration first of the emperor and then of their family by the monks.
2. Cf. also the remark of N. Oikonomides in *Docheiar.* p. 161.
3. *Xénoph.* no. 5.7–9 (παραδοτικόν γράμμα of October 1300 by the *apographeus* Demetrios Apelmenes): ... ἑτέρα γῆ τοῦ Νεακίτου ἐπονομαζομένη, ἀποσπασθεῖσα ἀπὸ τῆς μονῆς παρὰ τοῦ Τζιμπέα καὶ τοῦ Ἀμνῶν ἐκείνου καὶ δοθεῖσα διὰ πρακτικοῦ τῷ Δουκοπούλῳ ἐκείνῳ καστροφύλακι, εἶτα προσκυρωθεῖσα παρ' αὐτοῦ τῇ τοιαύτῃ μονῇ καὶ θείου καὶ προσκυνητοῦ ἐπικυρωτικοῦ προστάγματος ἐπὶ ταύτῃ προβάντος, ὡσεὶ μοδίων οὖσα τριακοσίων ...
4. See mainly *Docheiar.* no. 18.
5. The royal *stratiotes* Demetrios Armenopoulos leases ἐξαλειμματικὰ στασία for three νομίσματα as μορτή initially in the monastery of Megiste Lavra and later on in the monastery of Xenophon (*Xénoph.* no. 6 of August 1303).
6. *Esphig.* no. 30.12. It concerns the case of Demetrios Laskaris and the four monasteries.

Conclusion

Let us finally attempt some general conclusions about the behaviour of the representatives of the Church and the laity in Macedonia as holders of state lands and privileges from the twelfth to the beginning of the fifteenth century.[1]

Despite any justifiable reservations we may have, due to the source of our documents, in expressing with certainty an opinion as to whether those who benefited the most from the state were the monks or the laity, or who most frequently troubled their neighbours, or won more decisions in their favour in the case of litigation, or suffered a greater loss from properties being taken away, I think it becomes obvious in the end that monastic communities were the more privileged recipients.

This can be attributed to the fact that the monasteries, as institutions, had time on their side. Furthermore, they were associated with the spiritual rather than the political aspect of the Empire. The laymen holders of an *oikonomia* or privilege could die, be killed in wars or even displease the emperor at any time; even worse, in times of foreign occupation of Macedonia they had to choose sides and eventually suffer the consequences. The monks, on the other hand, represented eternal life, and therefore could wait for many years till they re-acquired the lands they considered their own. After all, the fact that they alone could pray for the Byzantine emperor, or the Serbian ruler Stefan Dušan, gave them a definite advantage in any claims or negotiations.

In conclusion, I would like to emphasize that it seems not to have been the intention of the Byzantine Empire in matters of economic concessions to favour monasteries over important individuals who had offered their services to the emperor. In fact it attempted from time to time the opposite. However, in the long run the measures against the increase of ecclesiastical property that the Byzantine emperors had tried to enforce all along simply did not work. The many documents granting privileges to monasteries, as well as those in favour of laymen, which finally ended up in the monastic archives are simply an indication of the outcome of many grants acquired by members of the middle and upper class, the *oikeioi* and *prosgeneis* of the Palaiologan times, based on their family or personal value and power, their bravery or loyalty to the emperor. The fall of the Empire found the monks, who were always praying for the salvation of the souls of the donors and benefactors of their monasteries, in possession of a great part of the fertile land of Macedonia.[2]

---

1. Cf. supra n. 3.
2. Cf. H.W. Lowry, "The Fate of Byzantine Monastic Properties under the Ottomans. Examples from Mount Athos, Limnos and Trabzon" *ByzF* 16 (1991) 275–311, with bibliography; E.A. Zachariadou, "Some Remarks about Dedications to Monasteries in the late 14th Century" *Mount Athos in the 14th–16th Centuries. Athonika Symmeikta 4* (Athens 1997) 27–31.

Michael Jeffreys

Manuel Komnenos' Macedonian military camps: a glamorous alternative court?

At Christmas in the year 1149 Manuel Komnenos arrived back in Constantinople and celebrated a triumph for three exploits. The first was the recapture of Kerkyra, while the other two events were less certain successes: a victory over the Sicilian fleet and a campaign against the Serbs and Hungarians. In the verses composed for the occasion by Theodore Prodromos, the poet says that the Emperor's brilliant return breaks a three-year darkness.[1] In other words, by the inclusive rules of Byzantine arithmetic, the Emperor's absence from the city had entered its third year. It was broken by the spectacular ceremonial of the triumph.

This paper will examine some evidence for what Manuel was doing away from the city during this period and other absences in the early years of his reign. In the warmer months he was of course involved in a series of important military campaigns. But much of the winters too was spent in military camps, where members of the imperial family seem to have taken up residence. As well as evidence already fully available, I will use further details derived from two inadequately published texts for which (with Elizabeth Jeffreys) I am publishing editions: the *Letters* of Iakovos Monachos and the *Poems* of Manganeios Prodromos.[2] I will attempt to integrate the results into patterns provided by Paul Magdalino, whose work is fundamental for all analysis of Manuel's reign.[3] An extra dimension will be given to the presentation of Manuel as a romantic hero, whilst a little will be added to speculation over twelfth-century administrative districts in the Balkans as they emerge in documents surviving from the end of the century.

Four, perhaps five areas outside Constantinople seem to have been used as base-camps for the army in the first two decades of Manuel's reign. Malagina/Melagina[4] in Asia Minor has nothing to do with Macedonia. Two others

---

1. Theodoros Prodromos, *Historische Gedichte* ed. W. Hörandner (Wiener byzantinistische Studien XI, Vienna 1974) 30.14, cf. p. 361.
2. The work of Manganeios Prodromos (conventional name for the anonymous poet of the MS *Marcianus Graecus XI* 22) is cited by the poem numbers given by E. Mioni, *Bibliothecae Divi Marci Venetiarum codices graeci manuscripti* (Rome 1973) III 116-25.
3. P. Magdalino, "Eros the king and the king of *amours*: some observations on *Hysmine and Hysminias*" *DOP* 46 (1992) 197-204 (henceforward Magdalino, "Eros"); id., "Τα χαρτουλαράτα της Βόρειας Ελλάδας το 1204" *Πρακτικά Διεθνούς Συμποσίου για το Δεσποτάτο της Ηπείρου (Άρτα, 27-31 Μαΐου 1990)* ed. E. Chrysos (Arta 1992) (henceforward Magdalino, "Χαρτουλαράτα"); id., *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143-1180* (Cambridge 1993) esp. 413-54.
4. Though not much mentioned in Manuel's earliest years, this was one of the historical ἄπληκτα or imperial Asian marching camps: see S. Šahin, "Studien über die Probleme der historischen Geographie des nordwestlichen Kleinasiens II: Malagina/Melagina am Sangarios" *Epigraphica Anatolica* 7 (1986) 153-66.

Byzantine Macedonia. Identity Image and History. Edited by John Burke & Roger Scott (*Byzantina Australiensia* 13, Melbourne 2000).

were in the ancient area of Macedonia, at Veroia and Pelagonia (Bitola), the latter apparently the most used of the camps at the time. The remaining two were in Thrace, and thus in the area which Manganeios Prodromos and other twelfth-century writers called Macedonia, at Veroe (Stara Zagora) and perhaps Philippoupolis (Plovdiv),[1] now in Bulgaria.[2]

The choice of base camp plainly depended in part, at least, on the enemy to be faced in the year's campaign. Veroia, the southernmost camp, was used as a base for attack across the central spine of Greece against the Normans when they occupied Kerkyra during the Second Crusade. Pelagonia and Stara Zagora (and probably Philippoupolis) were bases for war in the north-west against the rising power of Serbia and behind it the powerful Hungarian kingdom, the major military targets of the wars of these years. Stara Zagora in the north was also used in a year when there was trouble from the raiding nomads of the trans-Danubian plains. Malagina/Melagina was doubtless occupied when the campaign was in the East against the Turks. It is likely that there were also reasons of supply for varying the bases used, so as not to exhaust provisions from one area.

The evidence for the picture I am painting is varied, and chronologically imprecise, so that the dates below should be regarded as only indicative.[3] Some is direct: Kinnamos tells us that the winter of 1148-9 was spent at Veroia,[4] and Choniates that 1149-50 was spent at Pelagonia.[5] In 1152-3 Manuel was again at Pelagonia.[6] A later winter of uncertain date is placed by Kinnamos at Stara Zagora.[7] Less direct evidence is given by the fact that anecdotes about the Komnenan family and its feuds are nearly all set in the camps. The best-known early squabble about the comparison between Manuel and his father took place at Malagina/Melagina.[8] The later emperor Andronikos plotted against Manuel when the latter was hunting at Pelagonia.[9] The promotion of Manuel's nephew John to the rank of Protosevastos happened when John was badly wounded in the eye by an Italian during a tournament at Pelagonia.[10] It was at Pelagonia too that the same future emperor Andronikos was sleeping in a tent with the same John Komnenos' sister

1. A doubtful case: I infer the existence of a camp from the fact that Manganeios Prodromos (4.16-44, see below) imagined himself flying there to the Emperor Manuel, when the latter was absent from the capital.
2. This aggregation of two historical phases of the meaning of the name Macedonia represents an attempt to link this paper more closely than would otherwise be possible to the subject of the Conference.
3. See F. Makk, *The Árpáds and the Comneni: political relations between Hungary and Byzantium in the twelfth century* (Budapest 1989) 52.
4. Kinn. 96.
5. Nik.Chon. I 89.
6. Kinn. 127: the winter had begun with a visit to Constantinople.
7. Kinn. 133.
8. Kinn. 127-128.
9. Kinn. 127.
10. Kinn. 126.

Eudokia, thus committing incest, and had to cut himself out of the side of the tent when Eudokia's family came fully-armed at its front to catch the pair *in flagrante*.[1]

Another level of evidence is the emphasis given during this period to the cliché of imperial propaganda which contrasts the emperor living rough in tents on campaign with his subjects, who can sleep safe and comfortable in their beds. This is repeatedly used by Manganeios Prodromos in the five years following the Second Crusade (1147). As one example, I quote words which the poet puts into the mouth of Constantinople herself:

«Πολλά μοι,» λέγει, «δέδωκας καὶ θαυμαστὰ τροφεῖα,
τὰς νίκας τὰς περιφανεῖς, τὰ στρατηγήματά σου,
τὰς αὐτοχείρους συμπλοκάς, τὰ κράτη τῶν χειρῶν σου·
ἀλλὰ καὶ τί μοι τῶν λαμπρῶν τοσούτων δωρημάτων;
Πρὸ τῶν τιμῶν σου τίθεμαι τὸν τιμητήν σε βλέπειν,
καὶ πρὸ τῶν δωρημάτων σου τὸν μεγαλόδωρόν σε.
Τῶν εὐεργετημάτων σου μέγας ἐστὶν ὁ πλοῦτος·
ἀλλὰ τὸν εὐεργέτην μου βλέπειν ἐπιθυμῶ σε.
...
Ἄχρι καὶ τίνος μάχαιρα καὶ βέλος ἐν χειρί σου;
ἄχρι καὶ πόσου σκηνικῶς ὁ βασιλεὺς βιώσεις,
καὶ πασσαλίσκοις καὶ κοντοῖς συμπήξεις τὴν αὐλαίαν;...»

(4.807-19)[2]

Just as in the analysis of Magdalino,[3] this direct praise of Manuel's devotion in military terms is also reflected in a mythological way. In the fourth poem of Manganeios Prodromos, the poet presents a picture of the Graces, who naturally follow the young and handsome Manuel even on campaign. They are furious that they have been kept for so long away from the amenities of the capital, particularly the baths, so that their hair is filthy. They seem to tempt the emperor with the opportunity for some strictly forbidden mixed bathing with them, with the Erotes as bath attendants, so as to entice him back to the city. The quotation begins where the poet has been praising life on campaign but is now contrasting the delights of the city he is missing:

Ἀλλὰ καὶ ποῦ σοι τὰ λουτρὰ καὶ Χάριτες ἐκεῖναι
αἳ τοὺς πλοκάμους αὐχμηροὺς παραφυλάττουσί σοι
ὡς ἂν προσονειδίσωσιν ἐρωτικήν σοι μέμψιν
ὅτι παρέδραμες αὐτὰς ῥυπώσας ἐς τοσοῦτον;

1. Nik.Chon. I 104-105.
2. "You have given me", she says, "much wonderful payment for your nurture, your spectacular victories, your feats of generalship, your single engagements, the might of your arms; but what use to me are these great and brilliant gifts? We think it more important than the honours to see you the honourer, more important than your gifts to see you the great giver ... For how long will your hand hold a knife and an arrow? For what period, Emperor, will you live in camps and pitch your tent with pegs and poles?..." cf. 1.141-60; 4.645-50, 753-68; 8.181-5, 230-41; 20.384-90; 20.537-42; 34.56-60; 36.4-6 etc.
3. Especially Magdalino, "Eros".

Ὑπόστρεψον τὸν χαλινόν, ναί, νεῦσον τὸν ῥυτῆρα·
εἰσέλθε καὶ συλλούθητι ταῖς Χάρισιν ἐκείναις.
Εἰ γὰρ εἰσέλθοις, ἔρωτες θερμοδοτήσουσί σοι
δεξαμενὰς πληρώσουσι στιλβούσας, χρυσοχείλους·
τὸν θαυμαστὸν λουτῆρα σου περικυκλώσουσί σοι ... (4.776-784)[1]

Later Aeria, one of the Graces, speaks:

«Ὁρᾷς ἐκείνην τὴν Χρυσῆν, ὁρᾷς τὴν Ἀγλαΐαν,
ὁρᾷς καὶ τὴν Εὐπρέπειαν, κἀμὲ τὴν Ἀερίαν,
πῶς τοὺς πλοκάμους ἔχομεν χηροὺς ἐξ ἀλουσίας.
Αἰδούμεθα καὶ βλέπειν σε τοσοῦτον ἀλουτοῦσαι,
ὅτιπερ ὑπερόριος ὁ τῶν Ἐρώτων Ἔρως ...» (4.793-797)[2]

There is a technical term for being on campaign with the Emperor outside Constantinople. The word is ταξειδεύειν or a phrase including τὸ ταξείδιον, familiar from the treatises of Constantine Porphyrogennetos where he covers the movements of the imperial household[3] and also from some later and more popular forms of the Alexander-romance.[4] In the period I am describing we find this phrase used, for example, of both sons of the famous Sevastokratorissa Eirene (Manuel's sister-in-law), one sent εἰς τὸ ταξείδιον very young, to his mother's great fury, the other coming back ἀπὸ τοῦ ταξειδίου to visit his mother.[5] But it is also used of females, which is rare, to my knowledge, in other periods. In the heading of Letter 1 of the Monk Iakovos the Sevasokratorissa herself is said to be εἰς τὸ ταξείδιον with the emperor Manuel, thus presumably causing the separation which led to the correspondence.[6] In Manganeios Prodromos' poems, two of her daughters arrive in the city ἀπὸ τοῦ ταξειδίου,[7] in a phrase which has caused trouble because it has been translated "journey" by the common modern meaning of ταξίδι. These women had almost certainly been living at a camp. The existence of women at the camps is also confirmed by the anecdote mentioned before when the third of the

1. "But where are your baths and the famous Graces, who are keeping their hair filthy for you, so as to direct at you an erotic censure, that you have ignored them by letting them get so dirty? Turn back your bridle, yes, turn the reins; go in and bathe together with those Graces. If you go in there, Erotes will provide you with hot water, they will fill gleaming reservoirs lipped with gold, they will hover round your wondrous bath for you ..." (cf. Magdalino, "Eros" 201).
2. "You see the famous Chryse, you see Aglaia, you see Euprepeia, and me, Aeria, how dry our hair is through lack of washing. We are ashamed to appear before you so unwashed, because the Eros of Erotes is away from the city ..."
3. See Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *Three Treatises on Imperial Military Expeditions* ed. J.F. Haldon (Vienna 1990) 155.
4. The *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, CD-Rom D, gives several references each to recensions E, F, V and the *Fyllada* and *Rimada*: for details of these versions of the *Historia Alexandri Magni* see L. Berkowitz & K.A. Squitier, *Thesaurus linguae graecae: Canon of Greek Authors and Works* (3rd ed., New York and Oxford 1990) 208.
5. Manganeios Prodromos, Titles to poems 47 and 48.
6. See for example C. du Cange, *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae graecitatis* (Lyon 1588) Index auctorum 27.
7. Manganeios Prodromos, Titles to Poems 54 and 55.

Sevastokratorissa's daughters, Eudokia, shared a tent with the future Emperor Andronikos at Pelagonia.

Manganeios Prodromos shows awareness of the camps in other ways. In one poem he has been praising Manuel as if he were present, but then imagines himself flying through the air to hover above Philippoupolis, so that the rhetorical and narrative fiction of the emperor's presence could become a reality.[1] Another half-edited poem concerns the Sevastokratorissa's eldest daughter Maria when she married her second husband, Ioannes Kantakouzenos, one of the Emperor Manuel's chief military commanders. Addressing Ioannes in terms of enthusiastic panegyric, Manganeios Prodromos talks about his wedding with Maria, at which the poet had not been able to be present and sing appropriate songs. He asks Ioannes what the ceremony was like, basing his questions on the mythological marriage of Peleus and Thetis. I quote the first two lines of a long passage:

Πόσοι παρῆσαν τῶν θεῶν ἐν τῷ κλεινῷ σου γάμῳ;
Πόσοι τὸ νέκταρ ἔπινον; Πόσοι συνευωχοῦντο; (52.95-96)[2]

Several of the gods are mentioned as likely inclusions on the guest-list, together with Manganeios' regular mention of the Graces and the Erotes, and here the Muses, who bring with them some of the ancient poets with whom they were most connected. Only Sappho is missing — that is, the bride's mother the Sevastokratorissa, who was in imperial disgrace, and is represented as staying in Constantinople to mourn her dead husband Andronikos the Sevastokrator. The Erotes finally, in the imaginitive picture of Manganeios' poem, conduct the happy couple to the bridal chamber and put them to bed.

Where did this wedding take place? The information is given in a mythological way:

Ὦ Θετταλίας ὅριον, ὦ κλίμα τῆς Μυσίας,
τὴν Ἴδην νενικήκατε τὴν πάλαι θρυλλουμένην ... (52.144-145)[3]

Mt. Ida, where Peleus married Thetis, has been defeated by a place named by reference to Thessaly and Mysia (the Roman province which covered much of Bulgaria and the south of former Yugoslavia), clearly the place where the wedding took place between Ioannes and Maria. It is impossible, granted the flexible nomenclature of the area during the late medieval period, to be precise about the location. In my view, it is likely to have been in or near one of the camps.[4]

---

1. 4.16-44. It is by no means certain that Manuel in Philippopolis was resident in a camp. This poem is not completely understood by Magdalino, "Eros" 201 n. 28.
2. "How many of the Gods were present at your famous marriage? How many drank the nectar? How many joined the feasting?"
3. "Oh boundaries of Thessaly, oh area of Mysia, you have defeated Ida that was celebrated in ancient times..."
4. Alternative proposals for the wedding location — for example the city of Thessaloniki — go against the fact that geographical references to Manuel's early years nearly all move from Constantinople via the camps to the theatres of military operations. Other urban centres play only a very small role.

Three other poems of Manganeios, better known because they have been given a modern edition by S. Bernardinello,[1] refer to the poet's return from a period away from Constantinople. In the first and second, he talks of his homesickness, old age and illness and need for comfort and readily available hospital treatment, and pleads with the Sevastokratorissa's son Ioannes and his wife Maria to send him back to the imperial city. In the third poem he has just arrived at his goal in Constantinople, and makes a further petition to the emperor for a place in the Mangana Adelphaton, a comfortable home in which he hopes to be subsidised to spend his remaining years. He declares that he has just returned from barbarian Bulgarians:

'Απὸ Βουλγάρων σήμερον βαρβάρων ἀναζεύξας ...[2]

As a result of this phrase, it has been assumed that he had just got back from Sofia, and that Ioannes, his patron, was Governor of Bulgaria. In the circumstances, this is surely unlikely. It is more probable that we have here another case of residence at one of our camps. The Slavic-speakers he would have encountered in the neighbourhood of any of these camps are called Bulgarians in all the sources; of course they would have been barbarians to the Greek-educated city snob Manganeios.

It is possible that Slavic influence in the camps was more intense than their mere presence in the neighbourhood. Magdalino has written of the χαρτουλαράτα with Slavic names which appear in later documents, like the chrysobull for the Venetians of 1198 and the document (Partitio terrarum imperii byzantini) which divided the Empire among the crusaders of 1204.[3] One of the χαρτουλαράτα, Dobrochouvista, may be identified with an area near Veroia. Magdalino suggests persuasively that this was where Manuel camped in 1148-1149, and also makes the connection of the χαρτουλαράτα with the Chartularios, a commissariat official of the central, not the provincial administration. In that case, Dobrochouvista could be an area where provisions and particularly animals — horses and pack-animals — were assembled for imperial campaigns. It is interesting that a Slavic name is used for this area, admittedly in sources where the influence of the learned Byzantine language would be minimised. This could lead one to suggest that the provisioning of the army in the area was, in the twelfth century, largely in the hands of Slavic speakers. Perhaps the surviving references to χαρτουλαράτα do not exhaust the number of areas concerned. One could speculate that Manganeios Prodromos had been living in a camp where the staff were mainly Slavic speakers, with a clear economic function in the military commissariat. This could provide a precise meaning for his reference to return from Bulgarian barbarians.

---

1. Theodoros Prodromos, *De Manganis* ed S. Bernardinello (Padua 1972) 1-3.
2. "Having arrived today from barbarian Bulgarians..."
3. For references to matters mentioned in this paragraph, including these documents and the geographical secondary literature, especially the *Tabula imperii byzantini*, see Magdalino, "Χαρτουλαράτα".

Two final poems of Manganeios Prodromos give us a visual indication of what the camps might have been like.[1] Poem 145 is a description of the Sevastokratorissa's tent. This wealthy patroness of literature and the arts did not leave her culture behind, even when camping. The decoration of the porch of her tent matches in visual terms the minor mythological deities which we have seen filling Manganeios' poems. Since, as we have seen, Manganeios probably spent time in one of the camps, we may only assume that this is a realistic description.[2]

In the description of Poem 145 there are Erotes, Sirens, Satyrs, Nereids, Graces and Muses, together with anthropomorphic animals and exotic birds, such as were prominent in the miniaturist art of the time. The rhetorical thrust of the poem is a panegyric of the Sevastokratorissa herself: if her tent is as remarkable as this, how much more remarkable must be the mistress who dwells inside it? One may speculate on the way in which this extensive pictorial cycle was organised, and even more over the medium in which it was executed. Could something have been painted at so large a scale on such impermanent canvas as the porch of a tent, or should we perhaps think of applique technique? The other poem 146 is only four lines in length, a moral thought about the impermanence of all things, inspired by the picture of a beautiful tent deflating to the ground. This is short enough to have been embroidered in some way on the tent itself:

Ὁπόταν ἴδω τὰς σκηνὰς τὰς πεπηγμένας ταύτας
κεχαλασμένας ἐπὶ γῆς καὶ μεταπηγνυμένας,
τὴν πρόσκαιρον λογίζομαι τοῦ βίου παροικίαν
καὶ τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ σώματος τὴν μετατιθεμένην.[3]

It is time for a conclusion. The glamorous picture of the early years of Manuel Komnenos' reign was reinforced by the fact that the citizens of the capital saw their emperor comparatively rarely during that period. This may well have been a deliberate political decision: he was able to control his subjects' view of him by keeping his appearances brief, on occasions like triumphs. At the same time, the imperial propaganda machine was working through the speechwriters, whose products were delivered on many public occasions, and writers of rhetorical verse encomia like those of Manganeios Prodromos, which have survived in greater numbers from this period than from any other Byzantine age. These references used the chivalrous and mythological methods noted by Magdalino to enhance the aura of the absent Emperor. We may instance particularly the poem of Manganeios

1. Edition and commentary in J.C. Anderson and M.J. Jeffreys, "The Decoration of the Sevastokratorissa's Tent" *Byzantion* 64 (1994) 8-18.
2. There is also another poem (50) which makes several references to a tent (σκηνή), principally in terms of the tent of the earthly body (see e.g. 2 Corinthians 5, 1-4; 2 Peter 1, 13-14). However the references would become interestingly ambiguous, thus gaining extra point, if the poem were recited in a tent.
3. "These tents which are now pitched, whenever I see them lying collapsed on the ground and repositioned, I think of the temporary sojourn of human life, and the mutability of the tent of the earthly body".

which speaks of the marriage of Maria Komnene and Ioannes Kantakouzenos in terms of Peleus and Thetis.

We can only guess how far the image of the glamorous camp conformed with reality. The tents may have been beautiful, but what about the lack of city amenities? One wonders whether the Sevastokratorissa at times felt as bedraggled as Manuel's Graces on the mythological plane in the poem, unable to care for her hair as well as in the city. For the men, it is unclear whether the amatory intrigues which sometimes surface in the literature were any compensation for the hard military training which is referred to more frequently. What is sure is that for a decade and more in the mid-twelfth century the heart of the Empire moved from Constantinople to military camps in Macedonia — two in the ancient Macedonian heartland, and one, pehaps two, in Thrace, the point where the sliding geographical name of Macedonia rested in the twelfth century.

V. Nerantzi-Varmazi

Western Macedonia in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries

By the term 'Western Macedonia' I suggest the mountainous area to the west of the river Axios and, more precisely, from Mt. Vermion and the Pieria across to the Pindos range. The southern borders of this area are the mountains Olympus and Chasia, while as the northern limit we can consider a hypothetical line beginning at the Prespa lakes and Achrida and reaching the river Axios.[1]

Western Macedonia was for many centuries a remote province of the Byzantine state and we have little information about the area during the early centuries. Nevertheless it is certain that Western Macedonia underwent the same vicissitudes as the other Balkan provinces of the Byzantine Empire. It suffered from the incursions of the Goths in the fourth and fifth centuries and the invasions of the Avars and Slavs in the sixth and seventh centuries. Slavs later settled in the district, while Bulgarians occupied Western Macedonia twice during the fighting between Byzantium and Bulgaria in the reigns of Czar Symeon (893–927) and Czar Samuel (976–1014).

When in 1018 the last war between Byzantium and Bulgaria came to an end, the Byzantine emperor Basil II (976–1025) founded the archbishopric of Achrida in the homonymous city. His purpose was to replace the Bulgarian patriarchate, which had had its seat there during the reign of Czar Samuel. The archbishopric of Achrida later coincided with Iustiniana Prima, which had been founded by Justinian I during the sixth century in approximately the same district and, being the birthplace of that emperor, had many privileges. In the following centuries it is known as the archbishopric of Achrida, Iustiniana Prima and All Bulgaria.[2] In the ecclesiastical hierarchy of the Orthodox Church the archbishop of Achrida was ranked immediately after the patriarchs. This high position brought to the archiepiscopal throne some very important prelates. The best known of them are Theophylaktos of Achrida (1089–1108 or 1126) and Demetrios Chomatenos (1217–35). Each produced prolific writings during his stay in Achrida, thus providing much information about the district under their jurisdiction.[3] Western Macedonia belonged ecclesiastically to the archbishopric of Achrida during this period.

At the same time other events increased the interest of the Byzantine government in the Balkan provinces of the Empire. Turks conquered most of Asia

---

1. This clarification is necessary because V. Kravari, *Villes et villages de Macédoine occidentale* (Paris 1989) includes in her book many names of locations which belong in Northern Macedonia.
2. Greg. 1.27; G. Prinzing, "Entstehung und Rezeption der Iustiniana Prima Theorie im Mittelalter" *BS* 5 (1978) 269–87.
3. Theoph.Achrid. and Chom. (see Abbreviations); Gautier's edition has replaced the older one in PG 126 cols. 307–558. See also Gautier, "L'épiscopat".

Byzantine Macedonia. Identity Image and History. Edited by John Burke & Roger Scott (*Byzantina Australiensia* 13, Melbourne 2000).

Minor before the end of the eleventh century, and from that time on Byzantine historians and scholars refer more often to events taking place in the Balkan peninsula. In addition, the passage of various groups of crusaders crossing the Balkans in different directions aroused the interest of western chroniclers in these far-flung parts of the Empire. For all these reasons references to Western Macedonia during the eleventh and twelfth centuries became more numerous.

The political history of the province during this period is more or less known. Before the end of the eleventh century Western Macedonia was threatened by Normans from southern Italy and Sicily. The emperor Alexios I Komnenos obtained a decisive victory over them near Kastoria in 1083 and forced them to abandon their conquests and withdraw to Italy. About fifteen years later in 1097/8 an army of Norman crusaders under the leadership of Bohemond re-entered the same area and caused major destruction on its way to Constantinople and the Holy Land. Members of the First Crusade later followed the same route. Finally in 1107/8 Bohemond and his Normans managed to create fresh temporary disturbances in the far western parts of the Macedonian district. Theophylaktos, who was archbishop of Achrida during this period, characterizes the passage of the western crusaders as an invasion rather than a crossing, adding that as time went by the local population became used to Frankish damages and could bear them more easily than at first.[1]

A quiet period of some years then ensued, although the sources indicate the presence of the emperor Manuel I Komnenos in Veroia and Pelagonia, from where he organized the war against the Serbs in 1149. Serious turbulence arose again towards the end of the twelfth century. In 1185 the Normans, in a new attack against the Byzantine Empire, marched from Durazo (Dyrrachion) along the *Via Egnatia* to Thessaloniki, thus crossing Western Macedonia, while a little later the Serbs and the rebel *protostrator* Manuel Kamytzis[2] caused ephemeral problems in the northern parts of the area.

At the beginning of the thirteenth century, before the arrival of the crusaders of the Fourth Crusade (April 1204), the Bulgarian czar Kalojan occupied part of Western Macedonia. According to the *Partitio Romaniae*, signed by the crusaders after the capture of Constantinople in 1204, Western Macedonia, like all other Byzantine provinces, had to be divided among the crusaders, the Venetians and the Latin emperor of Constantinople. Putting this decision into effect, Boniface of Montferrat arrived in Thessaloniki and occupied the district between Veroia and Servia, but did not succeed in penetrating any further. For a brief period there was fighting between the Bulgarians, the crusaders' army and local authorities. These skirmishes favored the leader of the state of Epirus, Theodore Doukas, who then took possession of the whole district of Western Macedonia between 1215 and 1219. Western Macedonia remained a part of the state of Epirus until 1252/3, when the emperor of Nicaea, John III Vatatzes, incorporated most of it into his empire. Throughout this period Bulgarians were present in the northern parts of the area,

1. Theoph.Achrid. II Ep. 52 lines 4–17.
2. Nik.Chon. 533–4.

while members of the leading family of Epirus continued to claim various parts of Western Macedonia until 1259. It was not until after the defeat of the Epirots and their allies at the battle of Pelagonia that Western Macedonia became part of the state of Michael VIII Palaiologos. Two years later, in 1261, Michael Palaiologos took Constantinople from the Latins and restored the Empire in its ancient seat, decisively strengthening his position.[1]

From the ninth century, when the governing institution of themes was expanded to all the Balkan provinces of the Byzantine Empire, Western Macedonia administratively belonged to the theme of Thessaloniki. After 1018 and the submission of the Bulgarian State to Basil II, it became part of the newly founded theme of Bulgaria. Western chroniclers who followed the First Crusade in the last years of the eleventh century still refer to the area as Bulgaria.

In subsequent centuries administrative changes and evolutions took place much faster. The splitting of the themes into smaller units began and was continued in the years of the Komnenoi and the Angeloi. The *Partitio Romaniae* shows clearly that the subdivision of the old themes affected all the Balkan provinces of the Byzantine Empire. According to this text, in the district of Western Macedonia in 1204 there were the themes of Achrida, Veroia, Moglena-Moliskos, Prilep-Pelagonia, Prespa and Kastoria. The leaders of the Epirotic state and especially Theodore Doukas followed the same tradition in the provincial administration of their state. During the reign of Theodore Doukas Western Macedonia was divided into several small themes, each of which included a city or a castle and the surrounding area. The governors of these small themes often took the title of *doukas*.[2]

Because of this administrative subdivision, the role of the local governor became more and more important. Theophylaktos of Achrida, archbishop at the time of Alexios I Komnenos (1081–1118), refers with nostalgia to the last creditable governor of the district of Achrida and accuses the subsequent local authorities of abuses and oppression of the local population.[3]

The importance of the provincial authorities is more obvious during the thirteenth century, particularly in the granting of justice. In Achrida the episcopal court of the archbishop Demetrios Chomatenos functioned as a complete court of justice and was called upon to judge not only ecclesiastical matters but civil and property disputes as well. Demetrios Chomatenos and the local synod of Achrida based their decisions on the traditional Byzantine law of old times, which ranges from the Justinian *Code* to *Basilika* and the *Novels* of the emperors of the Macedonian dynasty. Their verdicts were honored by the parties concerned, public

1. Kravari, op.cit. 33–48.
2. G. Prinzing, "Studien zur Provinz- und Zentralverwaltung im Machtbereich der epirotischen Herrscher Michael I. und Theodoros Ducas" *EpChron* 24 (1982) 73–120, and 25 (1983) 37–112; Kravari, op.cit. 39, 42.
3. Theoph.Achrid. II Eps. 79 lines 10–15, 32.17–20, 45.62–67, 88.34–35.

opinion and the leaders of the era.[1] Decentralization, an inevitable fact after the capture of Constantinople by the crusaders of the Fourth Crusade, gave exceptional validity to all the above initiatives.

The main source of income for the people, as well as for the sovereigns of the district who received their taxes, was agriculture. This holds for Western Macedonia as well as for almost all provinces in the Byzantine Empire. In the mountainous regions of Western Macedonia and the plateaus between the mountains one could find fields, vineyards and pasture for small and large animals. Vineyards received special attention; most available money was spent on their improvement.[2] Fishing the rivers and lakes of Western Macedonia also contributed substantially to the local economy. From a letter sent by Archbishop Theophylaktos of Achrida we can assume that he gave away fish, probably salted, as a gift to his friends in Constantinople.[3]

The crusaders who crossed Western Macedonia were struck by the fertility and the abundance of produce in the district. According to the anonymous chronicler of the *Gesta Francorum*, the Norman crusaders who spent the Christmas of 1097 in Kastoria and the surrounding villages took away cattle, horses, donkeys and anything else they needed after they failed to come to an agreement with the inhabitants.[4] Since these incidents occurred during winter, the chronicler makes no mention of agricultural products.

Archbishop Theophylaktos, however, who was in Achrida at the same time, was not content with agricultural productivity in the district under his jurisdiction. According to his letters, both private and ecclesiastical property did not attain satisfactory levels of production. He mentions fields that had been neither farmed nor sowed.[5] He calls the district around Achrida a "desert"[6] and blames the destructiveness of the crusaders as well as the decrease in human resources.[7]

Conditions appear, however, to have improved in the thirteenth century. After the temporary conquests of the Bulgarians and Franks during the early part of the century, the inhabitants of Western Macedonia returned and took special care in the cultivation of their properties.[8] Their return, however, gave rise to many property disputes which the episcopal court of Demetrios Chomatenos in Achrida was called upon to resolve.

Heavy taxation of agricultural produce is particularly evident in the twelfth century. It is well known that the state under the Komnenan dynasty imposed heavy

---

1. Beck, *Kirche* 708–710; A.G. Jameson, *The Responsa and Letters of Demetrios Chomatianos, Archbishop of Achrida and Bulgaria: A Study in Byzantine Legal and Economic History in the thirteenth Century* (diss., Harvard 1957).
2. Chom. 25 (Pitra107), 51 (230), 53 (240), 91 (402), 105 (445)
3. Theoph.Achrid. II Ep. 13 lines 17–20.
4. *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum* I.3 ed. Rosalind Hill (London, Paris, New York 1962) 8.
5. Theoph.Achrid. II Ep. 45 line 57.
6. Ibid. 126.9–10.
7. Ibid. 24.26–27.
8. Chom. 47 (Pitra 211–15).

taxes on the inhabitants of the provinces of the Empire in its attempt to exercise a vigorous foreign policy.[1] According to the testimony of Theophylaktos of Achrida, the residents of Western Macedonia experienced the severity of the tax collectors, who did not even exempt uncultivated fields, as both earlier and contemporary Byzantine law permitted.[2]

This heavy taxation system resulted in injustices: small cultivators lost their properties, while widows, orphans and the poor were not protected in any way. Those malicious and audacious enough took advantage of the situation and managed to increase their wealth, unmoved by what their unfortunate neighbours were suffering.[3]

The evidence of Demetrios Chomatenos shows that during the thirteenth century the agrarian economy became more stable and taxation levels dropped despite the external disturbances. It is clear that the frequent changes of head of state during this period prevented the establishment of a permanent taxation system, which in turn allowed the population to cultivate their lands relatively undisturbed. Personal property included various assets such as houses and land, as well as animals.[4] Other items of property were mills (windmills and watermills)[5] and more rarely currency (*nomismata*, *hyperpyra* or *chrysini*).[6] In verdicts of the episcopal court of Achrida concerning divorces, clothing of all kinds is also mentioned.[7]

Most inhabitants lived in small settlements which formed separate villages. A few lived in walled towns around the castles. During this period the most important of the fortified castles of Western Macedonia were Achrida, Kastoria, Servia and Veroia. Grevena, Vodena and Staridola were smaller fortified settlements.[8] It is impossible to calculate the population of the castles in times of peace, but it certainly must have been small. This population, the 'Castlemen',[9] depended for their survival and prosperity on the possession and cultivation of land, as did the peasants in the villages. Besides owning the fields and the estates outside the city walls, some of them also had property inside the towns, such as houses, courtyards and small gardens.[10]

---

1. Nik.Chon. 208.31–3; Nik. Mouzalon, "Στίχοι εν τη παραιτήσει αυτού" ed. S. Doanidou, *Hellenika* 7 (1934) 106–150; *TM* 6 (1976): Recherches sur le XIe siècle.
2. Theoph.Achrid. II Eps. 45 lines 50–59, 77.73–82; Dölger, *Beiträge*; Ostrogorsky, *Steuergemeinde*; D.A. Xanalatos, *Beiträge zur Wirtschafts- u. Sozialgesch. Makedoniens im Mittelalter, hauptsächlich auf Grund der Briefe des Erzbischofs Theophylaktos von Achrida* (diss., Munich 1937).
3. Theoph.Achrid. II Eps. 11 lines 21–2, 26.20–2, 79.34–45, 96 passim.
4. The Greek words are ἀκίνητα (immovables) for houses and land and αὐτοκίνητα or κινητά (movables) for animals. Chom. 51 (Pitra 231).
5. Chom. 21 (Pitra 85), 81 (355).
6. Ibid. 53 (241), 92 (403).
7. Ibid. 136 (542); A. Kiousopoulou, *Ο θεσμός της οικογένειας στην Ήπειρο το 13ο αιώνα* (Athens 1990).
8. Kravari, op.cit. 63–7, 68–70, 335–6, 357–61.
9. Chom. 73 (Pitra 320).
10. Ibid. 73 (319), 81 (335).

The sources indicate another distinction within the population which concerns mainly the inhabitants of the towns: the crowd (τὸ πλῆθος) and the 'elite', the *logades*.[1] Wealthy townsmen along with state and church officials are included in this latter group. They constituted the upper class which made decisions about local issues as well as about general matters whenever the central government could not intervene.

In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries our sources refer to the occupations of most inhabitants as either peasants or landowners. Very seldom are other occupations mentioned, except, of course, soldiers and priests. A coppersmith, a tinker and a notary are also mentioned.[2] It is questionable, however, whether all these people could have met their everyday needs without being landowners as well.

Population movements were a feature of this period. The frequent recruitment of young and productive men obliged them to leave their homelands to serve in the Byzantine armed forces. Many of them never returned to their places of origin. This fact compelled Theophylaktos of Achrida to write to his friends in Constantinople to request a reduction in the number of men from remote provinces like his archbishopric[3] liable for military service. Some inhabitants of Western Macedonia, however, were obliged to leave their land under the pressure of heavy taxation. The demographic problem of the district is particularly obvious in this period.[4]

The turbulence of war during the first years of the thirteenth century caused further population movements. For example many of the inhabitants around Veroia fled after facing the violence of the Franks of the Fourth Crusade. Later, when the Franks were forced to abandon the district, most of the old inhabitants returned to their homes, where many faced property disputes because others had profited from their absence and cultivated their fields.[5] Servia suffered the most from the hostile incursions of the crusaders; its castle and city were almost destroyed. In subsequent years the members of the synod of Achrida took radical measures to repair the damage and reform the district, "having in mind only to re-establish a holy and sacred seat and gather together a scattered flock", in the words of Demetrios Chomatenos.[6]

Even in periods of comparative peace many inhabitants were forced to leave the district to seek a better future elsewhere. The case of the two brothers from Veroia is well-known: "... they sought a better way of living, so they left their country and went abroad to a foreign place".[7] Likewise, in cases of famine many were quick to

1. Ibid. 89 (395).
2. Ibid. 89 (394–5), 136 (541), 84 (371).
3. Theoph.Achrid. II Ep. 24 lines 22–4; F. Chalandon, *Essai sur le règne d' Alexis 1er Comnène* (Paris 1900) 296–301.
4. V. Nerantzi-Varmazi, "Ο Θεοφύλακτος Αχρίδας και ο Δυτικομακεδονικός χώρος" *Byzantina* 13 (1989) 343–9.
5. Chom. 102 (Pitra 436).
6. Ibid. 78 (335–6).
7. Ibid. 99 (421).

leave their native land. Furthermore, when a family had several brothers some of them preferred to seek their fortune in larger cities and distant places.[1]

The lack of any testimony concerning organized trade in Western Macedonia is striking. The soldiers of the the First Crusade declared that despite the prosperity in the area they could not come to an agreement with the people of Kastoria to buy their goods.[2] This is more likely to be an excuse for the pillaging they committed. Nevertheless no other text of the period gives any information about organized trade. The peasants must have been self-sufficient, and trade exchanges very limited.

No particular information concerning the ethnic formation of the population of Western Macedonia exists, although a distinction between native inhabitants and foreign invaders, like Franks and Bulgarians, is always present.[3] The Greek language of Demetrios Chomatenos's judicial verdicts, did not seem to cause any difficulties for Western Macedonian litigants. Many of the names of inhabitants referred to by Demetrios Chomatenos are entirely Greek, like Maria Alopophonou from Veroia, Leo Kontos from Vodena, the monk Niphon Grevenitis and many others.[4]

Testimonies concerning intellectual life in Western Macedonia during this specific period are extremely limited. When Theophylaktos of Achrida was first appointed archbishop and forced to leave Constantinople and go to Achrida in the last decades of the eleventh century, he constantly complained in his letters to his friends in the capital (which was at that time the intellectual capital of the world) that he lived in a place without any intellectual tradition at all.[5] The situation improved, however, and around the scholar-archbishops a circle of educated people was formed. Theophylaktos in his later letters refers to a small circle of pupils and friends.[6] Subsequent archbishops, like John Kamateros and Demetrios Chomatenos, helped widen this circle of educated priests in Achrida as well as in the episcopal sees subject to them.[7]

To conclude, it is obvious that during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries Western Macedonia, like other Byzantine provinces, experienced considerable turmoil. In spite of this the inhabitants of the district, settled in small villages or fortified castles with agriculture as their basic livelihood, managed to overcome these difficulties, solve many of their problems, survive and sometimes even prosper between the wars and the political changes of the times.

---

1. Ibid.136 (541).
2. *Gesta Francorum* I.3 (Hill 8).
3. Chom. 8 (Pitra 42–4), 102 (436), 48 (215–16).
4. Ibid. 47 (211), 105 (445), 119 (505) etc.
5. Theoph.Achrid. II Ep. 34 line 18, 55.5.
6. Ibid. 10.3, 41.2.
7. Ἡ δὲ μετριότης ἡμῶν μετὰ τῶν συμπαρόντων αὐτὴ ἱεροτάτων ἀρχιερέων is an expression which occurs regularly in Chomatenos' text.

Angeliki E. Laiou

The economy of Byzantine Macedonia in the Palaiologan period

For much of the Palaiologan period, Macedonia was the most important part of the Palaiologan state in economic terms, and thus its investigation is well worth undertaking. As we shall see, until the 1340s it was fairly well articulated, and therefore may also be studied as a model of a late medieval economy. In what follows, I shall examine the articulation of the economy of Macedonia, and also the stresses and strains on the system.

The topic cannot be discussed with the same assumptions for the entire Palaiologan period. A sharp dividing line must be drawn in the middle of the fourteenth century; and it has been argued that there is yet another dividing line in the 1420s, although I believe that in the latter case the indicators are far from clear.[1] A number of conditions important for the economy, that later would disappear or undergo fundamental changes, obtained until the 1340s. There was still a state which considered it its duty to provide minimal security for its subjects, even though it was a duty it frequently could not perform. For the countryside that meant some concern for security so that agricultural activities could be pursued. Although security was adversely affected by Serbian incursions in the 1280s and 1290s, the Catalan invasions of 1307–9 and the first civil war of the 1320s, at least the intent of safeguarding it was still there, as was the effort of the emperors to protect Byzantine merchants from the provinces, including the city of Thessaloniki, against piratical or semi-piratical attacks from the merchants and seamen of the Italian city states. The geographic boundaries of the state itself were still relatively large. Communications with Constantinople by land and by sea were open, and so was the way inland along the western routes to Belgrade. The interchange between cities and countryside could still function, for the cities were not cut off from their hinterland except in times of acute hostilities, which were sporadic rather than endemic. Thus, while conditions in the first half of the century were far from ideal, we can still speak of an economy that was still functioning, with its structures still descernible, and without major disruptions.

With the great civil war of the 1340s and the concomitant Serbian and Turkish incursions, all of this came to an end. During the second half of the fourteenth century the state functioned in a rudimentary way, war was virtually endemic, the countryside was devastated by enemy attacks which not only destroyed the crops but put into enemy hands the people and cattle on which production depended,[2] and

1. See J. Lefort, "Population et peuplement en Macédoine orientale, IXe–XVe siècle" *Hommes et richesses dans l'empire byzantin* II *VIIIe–XVe siècle* ed. V. Kravari, J. Lefort & C. Morrisson (Paris 1991) 63–82.
2. Looting was common also in the first part of the century, but at that time the Byzantines sometimes profited from it; after the middle of the century, the terms changed significantly, and it was mostly Byzantine lands that were looted: see A.E. Laiou, "In the

Byzantine Macedonia. Identity Image and History. Edited by John Burke & Roger Scott (*Byzantina Australiensia* 13, Melbourne 2000).

the cities were progressively cut off from their hinterland as land communications with Thrace and Constantinople were interrupted after 1341 for a long time. The profound demographic and economic crisis which struck the Italian city states — due partly to the great epidemic of bubonic plague — had negative effects on Byzantine trade as well. So the conditions obtaining in the first half of the fourteenth century were, to a considerable extent, reversed thereafter.

The agricultural economy was, as is common in medieval states, the sector which engaged by far the greatest part of the labor force and much of the capital, and the source from which the primary surplus was derived. But agriculture alone makes for fairly simple economies, which this was not. There was also trade, and it is the articulation between the two that is of interest. Macedonia, Thrace and Thessaly were important agricultural areas. The main crop was cereals: wheat and barley were used for making bread, while other kinds of grain were also grown. A testament of a proprietor who was relatively prosperous but by no means a great landlord shows that he cultivated on his land grains that were used primarily for fodder along with those used for human consumption: vetch (ῥόβη), rye (βρίζα), millet (κεχρίν), in amounts much smaller than wheat.[1] There was polyculture, that is to say, diversified production, including that of cash crops. The peasant plots included vineyards. Indeed wine was a major cash crop, as well as being a crop for domestic consumption, both for peasants and for greater landlords, including monasteries.[2] Flax was also produced. Rice, which was a crop known to the Byzantines and cultivated in late fourteenth-century Crete, does not seem to have been grown here. Olive cultivation was not important, undoubtedly for reasons of terrain and climate, although some olive trees are mentioned in the Chalkidike. On the other hand, fruit trees are mentioned; every peasant household, generally speaking, had fig trees, mulberry trees, perhaps attesting to the production of raw silk, pear trees, walnut, almond and cherry trees. In the very fertile area around the Strymon River, peasant households owned large numbers of fruit trees. There was some cotton and legumes. Peasants also owned beehives, and in the areas around the rivers (the Strymon, for example) fishing was an important secondary agricultural occupation. Finally, there were, of course, oxen, used for agricultural labor, and sheep and goats. Some peasant households owned large flocks, indeed this is the steepest differentiating factor in measuring the wealth of peasant households. In one case, in the village of Gomatou in 1300–01, the largest flock comprised 300 animals, and four households owned 770 (65%) of the 1193 sheep in the village; the great majority of households did not own any, although it is

---

Medieval Balkans: Economic Pressures and Conflicts in the Fourteenth Century" *Byzantine Studies in Honor of Milton V. Anastos* ed. Speros Vryonis Jr. (Malibu 1985) 148ff.

1. This is the testament of Theodosios Skaranos in *Xérop.* no. 9; it has been studied by J. Lefort, "Une exploitation de taille moyenne au XIIIe siècle en Chalcidique" *Aphieroma Svoronos* I 362–72.
2. On all of this see Laiou, *Peasant Society* 26ff, and P. Schreiner, "Die Produkten der byzantinischen Landwirtschaft nach dem Quellen des 13.–15. Jahrhunderts" *BHR* 10 (1982) 88–95.

possible and indeed probable that the tax registers which are our major source did not record the ownership of a single sheep or one or two goats.

These few elements can give us a partial picture of the agrarian economy, as it affected the peasantry; it should be mentioned here that the peasants we are talking about were dependent peasants, the *paroikoi*, and for the most part dependent on monasteries. The existence of polyculture is normal in pre-industrial peasant societies. It reflects the need for self sufficiency, and to some degree fulfils it. Thus a peasant household could normally be self-sufficient in the staple crops, except in times of bad harvests. But self-sufficiency is seldom absolute, and certainly was not so in this case. While the population of *paroikoi* may not have marketed their grain (except perhaps for what helped pay their tax), both vineyards and flocks of animals could produce marketable surplus. Flax, wine, the products of oviculture and cotton were all cash crops. The great variation in the number of sheep and goats owned by peasant families, and the existence of large flocks, suggests very strongly that this was an activity whose products were commercialised: after all, it is not to be expected that a single household could drink all the milk, eat all the butter and process all the wool produced by 300 sheep. Wool is the most interesting by-product of sheep raising, because its use involves manufacturing activity of some kind. A number of configurations are possible in the trading of wool. It is possible that the peasants sold their wool to large landowners, for example the monasteries, which had their own production of cloth, although they also bought it in the market, as we know from the *typika* of the twelfth century. They may have sold it, either as wool or as yarn, to the cities, and indeed there is strong evidence that there was wool manufacturing in both Serres and Thessaloniki.[1] Finally, there may have been small cottage industries of woollen cloth. In the late thirteenth century the Patriarch Gregory Kyprios ordered a cloak made of rough cloth. He wanted it plain, and it was to be woven in the countryside, in a village inhabited "by men who wear cloaks and make them," that is, in a place which specialised in the production of such garments.[2] Of course these possibilities are not mutually exclusive, indeed the most likely probability is that they all existed simultaneously. What in any case is interesting to stress is that a few of the dependent peasants had a large surplus of an eminently marketable commodity. It should also be noted that this type of enterprise and investment, i.e. investment in sheep, could be quite risky, for these were the most mobile assets of a household, especially a peasant household, and therefore the first to fall prey to marauders or soldiers out for loot. Thus, when Andronikos III attacked the Albanians in Epirus in 1336 his spoils included

1. On Thessaloniki see K.–P. Matschke, "Tuchproduktion und Tuchproduzenten in Thessalonike und in anderen Staadten und Regionen des späten Byzanz" *Byzantiaka* 9 (1989) 47–87, although I think that the cloth production of the late fourteenth – early fifteenth century is exaggerated; for Serres see A. Laiou, "Κοινωνικές δυνάμεις στίς Σέρρες τό 14ο αιώνα" (in press). Cf. *infra*.
2. S. Eustratiades, "Γρηγορίου τοῦ Κυπρίου Ἐπιστολαί" *EkklPhar* 2 (1909), letter no. 87 to Neokaisarites, who was in the χωρία of χλαινηφόρων ἀνδρῶν καὶ χλαινεργατῶν τινων. Letter no. 82, to Staurakios, mentions a hat being woven in Thessaloniki on Gregory's commission.

300,000 oxen (an incredible number for mountainous Epirus), 5,000 horses and 1,200,000 sheep.[1] In Macedonian villages the flocks declined precipitously during the first half of the fourteenth century: in 1320/1 the size of the flocks of the village of Gomatou (now consisting primarily of goats, not sheep) was half what it had been in 1300/1, and the largest flock comprised only 70 goats; by 1341 there was a single flock owned by one family and made up of ten sheep.[2]

Vineyards were an important and valued source of wealth; they were given as dowry, bought and sold, and a peasant household might seek to increase its ownership of vineyards by clearing and planting a piece of land. They produced the other major marketable commodity, wine (and raisins), but they were much more equitably distributed among peasant households, over three quarters of which owned vineyards. This suggests that wine was produced primarily for household consumption, with the surplus being marketed. Presumably, those at the upper end of the scale had most of the opportunity and most of the surplus to send or take to market. All of this holds true for the first part of the fourteenth century. For the second part, we have very few comparable sources as far as the peasantry is concerned, but productivity seems to have been down because of the political instability that we have already mentioned.

A good deal of the arable land, along with woodlands, fisheries, pastures and so on, was owned by great landlords and worked by the dependent peasants. The great landlords concentrated into their hands the surplus production in three ways: one was the payment of rent by the peasants, in kind, I think. This appears in the sources as *dekatia*, i.e. 10% of the crop, but it actually varies according to the arrangements made between tenant and landlord and who owned the equipment and the seed.[3] Secondly, the landlords, or at least the monastic landlords and those who held special privileges granted them by the state, received the tax that in the past the peasant had paid to the Treasury; this was at least partly a payment in cash, which in itself means that the peasant had to market some of his produce. Finally, the landlords could and did have a domanial reserve, although never so considerable as it was in western Europe, and this was cultivated by peasants who either owed labor services or were paid in cash. A very considerable part of the surplus, therefore, found its way into the storerooms of great landlords. What happened to it?

Undoubtedly, some of the agricultural production that ended up in the hands of the landlords was slated for consumption by the household, the community or the retainers. That could be a considerable number of people, if one realises that we are talking here of the great monasteries of Mt. Athos as well as the retinue of a man such as John VI Kantakouzenos. However, self-sufficiency is not much to live for, and the monasteries of Mt. Athos had, already since the eleventh century, marketed their surplus production, especially wine, but also cereals. The estates of great

1. Kantak. I 497.
2. Laiou, *Peasant Society* 173–4. The 70 goats were owned by the household of Eudokia, widow of Kapasas; see *Ivir.* III no. 79 line 154.
3. N. Oikonomidès, "Terres du fisc et revenu de la terre aux Xe–XIe siècles" in *Hommes et richesses* II 321–37.

secular landlords and the great monasteries had both included market towns, at least since that period. In the fourteenth century the situation was no different. The Athonite monasteries sold their produce in Thessaloniki and Constantinople, and the very considerable production of the region of Serres, where the Kantakouzenoi and others had extensive properties, was carried down the Strymon and exported from Chrysoupolis. It is possible that other, smaller ports existed in this period on the eastern side of the Strymon Delta, where smaller boats could put in.[1] Grain was sold both internally, in the Byzantine market, and to Italian traders.[2] Thessaloniki, Serres and Chrysoupolis were centres for the concentration and export of agricultural products, especially grain. Until the middle of the fourteenth century, Thessaloniki exported grain to Venice and also to the western Balkans, including Dubrovnik.[3] Indeed, the export of grain was an important component of the entire Mediterranean trade system, for it constituted one part of a two-part exchange which, in oversimplified terms, may be seen as an export of grain (and some raw materials) from the Byzantine Empire against cloth, especially woollen cloth, from western Europe. It is important here to keep a sense of proportion. These terms of exchange obtained not only for Byzantium but also for the rest of the eastern Mediterranean (if one includes spices, as products re-exported from the eastern Mediterranean). And in this larger system the part Byzantium played was small. But everything is a matter of scale. And if in the Mediterranean scale the Byzantine component is small, within the Byzantine economy the export trade is rather important.

If one wishes to test the outside possibilities of the Byzantine agricultural economy, one may look at the case of John VI Kantakouzenos, who was a great aristocrat and a great landowner. He was a mediocre emperor, but that only goes to show that a talent for politics does not come naturally to the very rich. Besides, we do not know that he had any talents for economics either; the economist in the family was his mother, as was often the case with great aristocratic households in Byzantium.[4] His description of his material losses during the great civil war has been quoted so often that it has become a commonplace. Let us look at it, however, not as an index of wealth but as a portfolio. He did not specifically mention his great estates, which we know he had, and we know they were concentrated in Macedonia, especially in the rich Strymon valley and in Serres.[5] Quite as might be

1. A. Dunn, "Loci of Maritime Traffic in the Strymon Delta (IV–XVIII cc.): Commercial, Fiscal and Manorial" (in press). I thank Mr. Dunn for letting me see the manuscript of this interesting study.
2. The correspondence of the Patriarch of Constantinople Athanasios I attests that the provisioning of the capital in the early fourteenth century was in the hands of both Italians and powerful Byzantines, including merchants.
3. A. Laiou, "Η Θεσσαλονίκη, η ενδοχώρα της και ο οικονομικός της χώρος στην εποχή των Παλαιολόγων" *ByzMak* 183–94.
4. See A. Laiou, "The Role of Women in Byzantine Society" *JÖB* 31 (1981) 241ff; and eadem, "Observations on the Life and Ideology of Byzantine Women" *ByzF* 9 (1985) 59–102, passim.
5. Kantak. II 192.

expected, in a list of assets lost he mentioned his movable and liquid assets. He lists 1,000 pairs of oxen, which were used in farming his estates. There were 50,000 pigs producing, one might imagine, vast quantities of lard and meat, not to mention the bristles which were used by painters and those who decorated rich houses with frescoes,[1] and 70,000 sheep, again with a prodigious production of wool. There was, he says, an "incredible" quantity of crops, hard to estimate. Presumably these were in storehouses and since, as far as we know, the attack on the properties of the powerful took place mostly in the cities, in urban storehouses. There were 300 mules, 500 donkeys, and 200 camels. He lists 2,500 mares, which may have been used for breeding draft horses. As for the money he and his mother lost in Constantinople and other cities, neither he nor anyone else could tell how much it was, which means that it was so much that, again, it could not be estimated.[2] What we have here, if we remember that the quantities mentioned are suspect and undoubtedly exaggerated, is the capital needed to run a group of very large estates (probably the largest in the Empire at that time) and an inkling of what such estates yielded. In terms of the capital engaged, we have oxen and possibly draft horses; unless one imagines that the mares, which were certainly breeding mares, were producing horses exclusively for sport (polo) or for the army. The cattle, sheep and pigs required considerable investment. Transport by land was taken care of by use of the draft animals, donkeys, mules and camels. As for the yield, the "incalculable" quantities of grain stored in the warehouses must have been stored in part for the market; his vast quantities of money must have been realised primarily from agricultural and pastoral activities, and presumably came from the sale of grain and hides, meat, and wool. Undoubtedly some of these products, especially the animal by-products and the grain, fed the mills and shops of the Kantakouzenoi in Serres; we know that a number of the manufacturing shops in that city were in the hands of the great landlords. Another part of the production must have been sold to independent manufacturers; Theodora Kantakouzene owned workshops in Serres which she rented out, and the existence of independent manufacturers is also attested from other sources.[3] A sense of proportion must be preserved here: the workshops for which we have evidence were small; whether there was large-scale manufacturing on the estates of people like the Kantakouzenoi (of whom there were not many) remains open to question. In any case, the production of this large estate should be connected with the manufacturing of woollens in Serres and perhaps in Thessaloniki. It may also be noted that the properties of people like Kantakouzenos were probably relatively safe from small-scale marauding attacks. On the other hand, they were very much exposed in times of grave political or military crisis.

One other category of landed proprietor is visible in our sources. That is the medium-scale independent proprietor, whether resident in a city or not, who again

1. V. Tsiouni, *Παιδιόφραστος Διήγησις τῶν ζῴων τῶν τετραπόδων* (Munich 1972) verses 396–401.
2. Kantak. II 184–5.
3. For Theodora Kantakouzene see *Koutloum.* no. 18; for the rest, see Laiou, "Κοινωνικές δυνάμεις".

engaged in polyculture although he (or she) did not work the land personally. The relative importance of this type of proprietor is not, at this point, easy to estimate, partly because as a category they are not well represented in the sources and are just beginning to be studied. We can already say that both the new documentation that is coming to light,[1] and the study of long-known documents are permitting us to understand better the activities of such people. They had the possibility of producing enough grain and wine not only to provide for the needs of their household but also to send to the market. The lands of Theodosios Skaranos, one representative of this category, were cultivated by direct exploitation, with the landlord furnishing the animals (three buffaloes, two oxen, one donkey, two horses), the implements and the seed. He had approximately 270 *modioi* of arable and 24 *modioi* of vineyards. He sold some wheat but his marketable produce was primarily wine, of which 600 measures were to be sold, almost double the amount he kept for purposes of consumption.[2]

A certain Theodore Karavas has left a will, dated 1314, which provides interesting evidence for the activities of a proprietor with medium-sized holdings. He lived in Thessaloniki and had both arable land and vineyards around the city. He had, however, invested his money mostly in vineyards, of which he had 61 *modioi* (almost 61 *stremmata*) while only 10.5 *stremmata* were given over to wheat cultivation. The possession of a single ox and a cow do not allow us to determine whether this was direct exploitation of the land or not, although an ox would have sufficed for the cultivation of 10.5 *stremmata*; besides, he also owned the amount of seed necessary for the land that could be cultivated by one ox. The predominance of vineyards is not surprising when we realise that Karavas was also a merchant. Wine was, as we have seen, a good cash crop, and vineyards need less capital investment than does arable land. Thus he was a man whose agricultural production was primarily geared to the market. When he died he left, among other things, papers showing debts owed to him in grapes and grain. This is undoubtedly a matter of advance purchase of crops from peasants, a process which fulfils two purposes: it functions as a concealed loan to the peasant, and it concentrates into the hands of merchants commodities which they can then market. [3]

We thus have three types of proprietors producing for the market, in quantities which are different enough for us to posit different kinds of marketing. For the most part, the peasants would have sold just enough to pay their taxes and whatever part

1. For example, P. Schreiner, *Texte zur spätbyzantinischen Finanz und Wirtschaftsgeschichte in Handschriften der Biblioteca Vaticana* (Vatican City 1991) no. 3; and Laiou, "Κοινωνικές δυνάμεις" and "Θεσσαλονίκη".
2. This document has been studied by Lefort, "Exploitation".
3. The will is published in *Chil.* Appendix I no. 27. Of course, this type of purchase need not necessarily be made by merchants: it can just as well be made by the prospective consumer who, like the merchant, is gambling on the expectation that the eventual market price of the commodities will be higher than what he has paid to secure part of the harvest. In Karavas' case it is out of the question that, with so many vineyards, he was purchasing wine for his own household consumption; the size of the vineyards he owned is sufficient to show that part of his production was commercialised.

of their rent might be due in cash; they might sell a little grain and probably some wine, perhaps once a year. The normal pattern of this kind of marketing is for money to remain in the possession of the peasant for a rather short time, say between the time of the harvest and the day the tax is due, which fell on the traditional date of September 15. The peasant might also sell enough to have a little left over for extraordinary expenses (the jewelry or household furnishings given as dowry?) or some small luxuries. The few who owned relatively large numbers of sheep could lay their hands on more cash. But for the majority of peasants it would seem that they had some surplus to put on the market but not very much, at least not individually. The advance purchase arrangements, attested also by the Patriarch Gregory Kyprios, may be an indicator of rural poverty: Gregory pities the "miserable peasants" who are on the receiving end of these arrangements, and claims that it is need that forces them into such practices.

The middle-level proprietors also did not individually sell great quantities of goods. When Karavas composed his will he had in hand 300 measures of wine (about 3,120 litres), 30 *tetartia* (1,728 kg.) of wheat and 10 *tetartia* (576 kg.) of millet.[1] Assuming that the price of wheat was in the vicinity of 2 *hyperpyra* 2 *keratia* per *politikos modios*, from the sale of the wheat he could realise about fifteen *hyperpyra*.[2] Presumably he had already sold most of the year's wine, since the will was composed in May. Certainly, his 61 *modioi* should have produced a lot more than 300 measures. When he died Skaranos had, from his 24 *modioi* of vineyard, 600 measures of wine for sale, while the total of his reserves, plus the wine the monks had drunk that year, came close to 2000 measures (but it is not clear how many harvests the reserves represent). Karavas' production should have been proportionately greater, but in any case these are not vast quantities to throw on the market. However, between that and his other activities he had a cash surplus. In cash he only left 52 ducats, and among his household effects the only things that might have been expensive were a silk coverlet, a large chest, and a few pieces of jewelry, mostly in silver, and two gold rings. He was owed some agricultural products, and he himself owed 17 hyperpyra and 7 ducats. Whichever way one counts it, this is not an unshakeable fortune. On the other hand, he had twelve houses, some of which he had inherited, while others he had purchased. Was he getting residential rent from all these houses or were some of them shops (even though the term is not used in the text)? It is hard to know, but in any case this was an interesting investment in real estate on the part of both Theodore and his family.

While people like Karavas could not have had much of an impact on the market individually, collectively their production may have been significant. They were sufficiently above the level of subsistence to have made some economic decisions

1. The *tetartion* is equal to the commercial *pinakion*, i.e. to 76.878 litres (one fourth of a commercial *modios*) or 57.6 kg. See E. Schilbach, *Byzantinische Metrologie* (Munich 1970) 108.
2. J.-C. Cheynet, E. Malamut & C. Morrisson, "Prix et salaires à Byzance (Xe–XVe siècle)" *Hommes et richesses* II 358.

with profit maximisation in mind, that is, to decide when to sell, depending, among other things, on whether prices were up or down.

Finally, large proprietors, lay and ecclesiastical, must have had considerable impact on the market. They could commercialise products in relatively large quantities, if one takes into account the very extensive properties of great monasteries: Lavra, Iveron, Docheiariou, Chilandari, St. John Prodromos in Serres, as well as those of the great landlords such as the Kantakouzenoi or the Choumnoi, who also owned substantial lands in Macedonia, especially in the Strymon valley. One must suppose that the wheat exported from Thessaloniki and Christoupolis or stockpiled in Serres and Constantinople came from these estates (and the estates in Thrace, including imperial ones). This was wholesale trading.

It was in the cities that agricultural products of the large and medium-sized landowners found their markets. Peasants may well have sold their products either at the annual domanial fairs or in occasional markets in the towns. But the annual fairs on the estates of Mt. Athos yielded too small a revenue to have functioned as real outlets for the production of the large estates, while the grain market in the Mediterranean was too well articulated to depend on such low-frequency periodic markets. The cities were rich in this period. Even when all of the exaggerations of our sources are accounted for, one still retains the picture of Thessaloniki as a major urban centre with two complementary actvities: the agricultural production of its hinterland and the trade of its port, a set of activities that is known since the early tenth century.[1] It still had its land communications with Thrace and ultimately Constantinople. Nevertheless, these communications were not of major economic importance; in the economic sphere, Thessaloniki functioned in this period as an outlet for the production of Macedonia and Greece, and also as a port of entry for the hinterland of the western Balkans, which imported both cereals from Macedonia and cloth from the West. Serres is an interesting city with a diversified economy which includes both the marketing of products of the countryside (a "fish market" is mentioned) and a secondary sector tied to the agrarian economy: a large number of mills and bakeries attests to this, as does a significant number of otherwise unspecified "shops" or "workshops" (ἐργαστήρια) which must have treated products such as animal skins and wool, for trade in woollen cloth is attested for Serres.[2]

There is thus a fairly well articulated economy in Macedonia of the early fourteenth century, with agricultural production being integrated both with a manufacturing sector and with a trade sector. However, one must not paint too rosy a picture of a situation that had inherent structural problems and constraints. One problem was the economic crisis that scholars agree existed among the peasantry. Whether this was the result of earlier demographic pressures, which had led to the use of increasingly low-productivity lands, or of an already present demographic

1. Laiou, "Θεσσαλονίκη" passim.
2. Laiou, "Κοινωνικές δυνάμεις" passim.

decline,[1] it is quite certain that in the course of the first half of the fourteenth century the peasant population became poorer both in terms of productive capacity (measured by the number of oxen the population possessed) and in terms of the ownership of lands capable of producing a cash crop (measured by the surface of vineyards). The flocks also declined precipitously.

What that means in the terms we have been discussing is at least two things. First, the production of cereals, which was for the most part appropriated by the landlords, was on a downward curve; second, those elements of the peasant holding that produced marketable surplus, on which they themselves made cash, were on a similar curve. There is, in the same period, evidence of flight of the population from the monastic estates. As the population of these estates became poorer, it also became more sparse. The peasants may have moved to the domains of lay proprietors, as we know some did in 1341; or into towns where, however, they can not have made a very good living; some may have become brigands.[2] There was, to be sure, land clearance undertaken in this period, especially in order to plant vineyards, and some investments, for example, in the building of mills. This was undertaken with the labor of the peasants but also through the instigation of monasteries and probably lay landlords as well. This investment must not be minimised, but it is one of the few healthy signs in an otherwise deteriorating situation.

In the cities, too, while there was real prosperity coming from trade, there were structural problems because the terms of trade were controlled not by the Byzantines but by the Italian merchants who were organising trade to suit their own interests. Despite the collaboration between Byzantine and Italian merchants, the situation created an increased element of vulnerability for the former. Thus there were tensions. The decline in the numbers and the productive capacity of the peasants led to a decline of overall production. The concentration of property in the hands of great landlords meant that their economic habits acquired greater importance. And to the degree that demand was dependent on international trade, there is a certain fragility.

These structural problems were greatly exacerbated by the multiple crises of the period which starts in 1341. Destructive civil wars, destructive foreign invasions, the (as yet unmeasurable) effects of the bubonic plague, the general demographic and economic crisis in Italy, western Europe and the eastern Mediterranean, all created conditions which disarticulated the economic life of Macedonia. As far as the countryside is concerned, the main problems were two. A profound demographic crisis affected the rural population and thus diminished the productive element of the population. At the same time, there was a restructuring of the ownership of economic resources. The great lay aristocracy lost its lands. The second level of aristocrats and landowners may have suffered less. And the monasteries profited, relatively speaking, because they were able, through

1. For these two points of view see Lefort, "Population et peuplement" 75ff and Laiou, *Peasant Society* esp. chs. 6–7.
2. Laiou, ibid. 260ff.

arrangements with the Serbs and the Ottomans, to retain part of their lands, as well as to benefit from donations of lands by the aristocracy which could no longer manage them.[1] There is thus a heavily increased economic presence of the monasteries, especially the Athonite monasteries, in the countryside. Although half of the monastic estates had been given to soldiers after 1371, in the late fourteenth and first half of the fifteenth century the transfer of land from laymen to monasteries becomes evident. The privileged economic position of the monasteries is indicated in a document of 1408, a *prostagma* of the Emperor Manuel II, who was then in Thessaloniki.[2] Aside from the return of part of the confiscated lands, what is interesting to us are the provisions regarding the disposition of agricultural products. The monks of Mt. Athos are relieved of the obligation to provide a certain amount of wheat for biscuit for seamen; they thus have more disposable grain per cultivated acre than do the other landowners of Kalamaria and Hierissos. They are exempted from the payment of taxes on flocks, which means that the wool, meat and so on that they get from these flocks comes cheaper to them than to other, non-exempt landholders. They are relieved of a tavern-tax on their wine. They are allowed to sell their wine in Thessaloniki freely, while the governor of that city is forbidden to delay the sale of other wine until "his own" has been sold. This medieval practice, known as "monopoly," usually benefited the rulers; it is here not allowed, or discontinued. All of this means that the monks of Mt. Athos could market their products in privileged conditions. But the monastic landlords were probably rather conservative managers and investors.

The urban markets had also contracted. Thessaloniki was greatly impoverished by the effect of all the conditions mentioned above, and also by long sieges by the Serbian and Ottoman armies. From an exporter of grain the city had become an importer. The major difficulty was that it had lost its hinterland, which was in Serbian and then Ottoman hands. The integration of the rural and urban economies in western Macedonia had to wait until the Ottomans had established control over all of the area. Other cities seem to have fared better, especially those whose hinterland was under the same political control as the cities. Such is the case of Serres, both during the Serbian and during the Ottoman conquests (1345 and 1383 respectively). A few years after the fall of Constantinople Serres already shows a differentiated economy with a population that included merchants, cloth manufacturers, jewellers and so on.[3] It is true that in the 1420s and 1430s there is again evidence of some economic activity, but I do not think that it was considerable, and a good deal of it seems to have been concentrated in the hands of a few great proprietors.

---

1. On this see N. Oikonomidès, "Monastères et moines lors de la conquête ottomane" *Südost* 35 (1976) 1–10.
2. V. Mošin, "Akti iz svetogorskih arhiva" *Spomenik Srpska kraljevska Akademija* 70 (1939) no. 2.
3. P. S. Nasturel & N. Beldiceanu, "Les églises byzantines et la situation économique de Drama, Serrès et Zichna aux XIVe et XVe siècles" *JÖB* 27 (1978) 272.

A case brought before the Despot of Thessaloniki and the Emperor Manuel II in 1421 shows some of the problems of this period. A rich and aristocratic family of Thessaloniki, the Argyropouloi, had rented a large market garden from the monks of Iveron. They had made extensive capital improvements but the monastery complained that its revenues had not increased accordingly. The decision was to take the gardens, improvements and all, from the Argyropouloi and to give them to the monastery, which had behaved in a very conservative manner that did not foster investment.[1] In such circumstances no one could be blamed for not investing heavily in agriculture. Byzantine aristocrats did invest in trade in this period, and indeed in the first half of the fifteenth century trade recovered. But in Macedonia it labored under the conditions of insecurity and the difficulty of communication between cities and the hinterland that we have already described.

In conclusion I would argue that the economy of Macedonia in the Palaiologan period calls for a more qualified optimism than current scholarship sometimes exhibits. Certainly the region had then, as it always has had, much productive potential. The land is rich; agriculture and pasture can be very productive. There were mines in Siderokausia, and salt pans close to Thessaloniki and in the Strymon Delta, producing commodities that were greatly prized in the Middle Ages. Until the 1340s the economy was relatively well integrated and people from diverse social and economic categories had surpluses from agriculture which could be manufactured into finished products and/or marketed. While manufacturing labored under the weight of cheap western woollens, and trade under the dominance of Italian merchants, there was nevertheless a regional economy as well as an economy tied to international trade under disadvantageous conditions. The activities of the proprietor of moderate means, of the producer *cum* merchant are, I think, among the most promising aspects of this phenomenon. But if this economy seems to have been thriving, it was doing so under constraints. In particular, the economic condition of the peasant was unenviable enough that peasants were selling off their lands to monasteries and abandoning the land. This concentration of resources into a few hands may be a step forward in terms of economics, since such people are untrammeled by the constraints of self-sufficiency on very limited resources and can maximize profits and make new investments. However, such was probably not the case here. First of all, the impoverishment of the peasantry also meant the demise of a certain aggregate demand which, though admittedly limited and periodic, was nevertheless real. Secondly, while the monasteries did participate in investment, the part of the investment in land that depended on labor was a peasant investment; and that was in decline. Finally, with the concentration of property in the hands of the monasteries in the late fourteenth century, even considerable investment by forward-looking laymen was at risk as landlords simply sought to increase rents and certainly had no interest in rewarding entrepreneurship. In the end the exploitation of the peasantry bore fruit: the Ottoman system of exploitation was lighter than the Byzantine one, and the Ottomans were easily accepted. The civil

1. Dölger, *Schatz.* nos. 24 and 102.

wars of the aristocracy bore fruit: the aristocrats as a class lost their resources, and the pattern of both agricultural production and trade changed. The aristocracy participated heavily in trade but they did not control it. Political rivalries bore fruit: for a long time the economy could not function properly because of lack of unity of the geographic space. The Byzantine economy of Macedonia, in other words, was a diversified economy with different sectors which exhibited different degrees of responsiveness to the general economic environment. And certainly, here as elsewhere, economic activity and economic success or failure are not to be separated from social and political conditions and decisions. The successful-looking economy of the first half of the fourteenth century owed a good deal to relative political stability but was built on shaky social relations; it could not survive the admittedly overwhelming stresses of the second half of the century.

Index

Greek entries are found where they would be if they were transliterated according to the US Library of Congress system. Thus, for example, θ th, ξ ks, υ y, ὐ hy, φ ph, χ ch, ψ ps.

Entries for some place names include the people named after the place and the adjective derived from the name (e.g. Albania includes Albanian, Albanians).